AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. VI.—(XVI.)—JANUARY, 1897.—NO. 1.

THE DECREES OF THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

I.

THEIR OBJECT, PROMULGATION AND BINDING FORCE.

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii. A. D. 1884.

Commentaria in Concilium Plenarium Baltimorense Tertium, ex Praelectionibus Academicis excerpta. Auctore Nicolao Nilles, S. J. Oeniponte. 1888.

Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas quae Episcopis et Vicariis Apostolicis per modum Formularum concedi solent, ad usum Venerabilis Cleri Americani. Edit. III curante Joseph Putzer, C.SS.R. Ilchestriae. 1893.

THE laws and forms which regulate the discipline of the Catholic Church in the United States are clearly set forth in a volume of over four hundred pages, entitled *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii.* They have been officially promulgated and have served as the standard of ecclesiastical observance in the United States for more than ten years. The last chapter of the book (Titulus Ultimus) is entitled *De Concilii Decretorum Promulgatione et Efficaciori Executione.* It states in simple and impressive language that the Decrees of the Council are to be observed from the date of their promulgation by the Apostolic Delegate in all the different dioceses, and that no

plea is to be recognized which points to neglect or delay in their publication.[1]

Although the Fathers of the Council expressly declared that the Decrees were to be considered binding, independently of their promulgation in separate diocesan synods, it was declared advisable that, to secure better understanding and a more efficacious observance of these laws, the different bishops should hold synods for that purpose, either provincial or diocesan.

More than eighty bishops, ordinaries of the various dioceses for which the Decrees had been exclusively made, signed their names to this declaration. After a lapse of twelve years we are enabled to measure somewhat the effects of the Baltimore legislation in the different dioceses of the country. In forming a proper estimate of the efficacy of the Conciliar Decrees we must remember that the executives of the laws were, on the whole, the framers of the same. They had seen the need, they were free to propose and discuss, they could avail themselves, each, of the experience, knowledge and wisdom of many venerable brethren in the episcopate. Furthermore their authority, confirmed by Rome, both as lawmakers and executives, was unquestioned. That authority was based, not upon popular favor and popular views, but upon the eternal basis of responsibility to God, a fact which is designed to secure the prudent enforcement of a law on the one hand and implicit obedience on the other.

More than this. The deliberations of the Council showed that the care for the future observance of the law, with all its accompanying advantages, was no less in the minds of

1 "Ne ullus supersit dubitandi locus de tempore quo incipiet obligatio suscipiendi et exequendi Decreta Concilii hujus Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, et ne qua obtendi possit excusatio ob negligentiam vel moram, si qua fuerit, in iisdem per singulas provincias et diœceses promulgandis, declaramus et omnibus notum facimus cuncta et singula, quae in hoc Concilio Plen. Balt. III decreta et constituta sunt, vim suam habere plenariosque et integros effectus sortiri per universas hujus regionis ecclesias, statim ac per Rm. Deleg. Apostol. promulgata fuerint, quin opus sit ea denuo in synodis provincialibus aut diœcesanis promulgare." (Conc. Tit. ult. pag. 184.)

the bishops than the desire to safeguard the present interests of the Church in the United States. The professors of theology and of ecclesiastical jurisprudence were to take this well written digest of the law and discipline of the Church, specially applied to the circumstances of the North American mission, as a text in their schools ; they were to explain and follow it as the norm of action.[1] It was enjoined upon students of theology that they make themselves perfect masters of these Decrees (accurate et diligenter addiscerent), and of those of the previous Plenary Council, the ordinances of which were to be considered as still in force, except in such instances as pointed clearly to their abrogation or change. In fine it was declared that clerics and the laity were equally bound in reverence and obedience to these laws (et omnes cujusvis ordinis clericos et laicos iisdem debitam reverentiam et obedientiam exhibere teneri).

Thus we find a code of laws which has perhaps no equal elsewhere in its perfect adaptation of the general principles of disciplinary jurisprudence to local circumstances, safeguarded by the best of means—an executive whose interests for the preservation of order and the defense of God's Kingdom were intimately involved in the observance of these Decrees; and a clergy and people who recognized, externally and in conscience, as fundamental the principle of obedience to all rightly constituted authority irrespective of personal feelings. Theoretically speaking, a new golden age of the Church might have been called forth with such legislative dispositions in a land where there were no traditions to hamper us, where there was a fresh life and a free growth, and every blessing of sky and earth to hasten the ripening of the harvest in God's field.

Have we failed? It would be wrong and ill-advised to say so. Much good has been accomplished, under the blessing of God, as the direct result of the Baltimore legislation, and the fact is attested not only by the increase of means which foster Catholic progress, but also by the opposition of

1 Cf. Conc. Titul. praevium, pag. 3.

elements which, being hostile to the development of ecclesiastical institutions, are the first to give warning of any important accession to our strength. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that the all too common ecclesiastical fanfaronades, heard in high courts and low, indicate much oftener what we should be than what we actually are. No doubt those who enjoy the cant, in the comfortable reflection that their efforts constitute the glory of contemporary history without giving them really much trouble, place to their own credit what is in sober truth but the evolution of forces with which they have little or nothing to do. But the delusion does not profit anybody, and thinking men put no store by the official self-gratulations, or by the panegyrics upon mutual friends and ecclesiastical superiors who happen to hold the grindstone for sharpening axes and like implements of industry.

If we apply the sober measure of the written legislation, declared as both practical and necessary by men who had reason and right to know, to the practice in many cases and places of the present time, we have simply to admit that the Decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore have in a large number of cases remained a dead letter.

Why?

There are various reasons, valid or pretended, but worthy of the thoughtful consideration of every priest in the American household of the Church. We are sometimes oversensitive about making changes, and start at the very mention of the word "reform." Now, reform is always needed in the world; it is the very essence of Christianity, and the priest who does not either inaugurate or second reforms by the legitimate means of Christian discipline as given us in the precepts of the Gospel and in their application through the living authority of the Church, is simply an idle steward who buries his Master's talents and occupies a better man's place. The elder Ward used to say that a certain class of so-called conservative men, who wanted no changes and who enjoyed a sort of venerableness among people, because they left things alone and praised whatever did not trouble

them, were the greatest knaves on earth, and of such every good man should beware. However that may be, it is certain that the Plenary Councils of Baltimore contemplated definite and necessary reforms; that every priest was, by his very office, bound to take part, heart and soul, in the effecting of these reforms; and that wherever the conditions aimed at by the Council have not obtained, there its provisions have not been fully carried out—either because it was impossible to do so, or because the legitimate efforts have not been made by those who were charged with the execution of the Decrees.

Among the hindrances which have of necessity prevented the carrying out of the legislation of the Plenary Council, we may reckon in the main the difficulties of local separation in many dioceses which are not sufficiently populated to place priests in close communication with each other and with their bishops. Under such circumstances the principal means which the Council (Conc. Plen. Balt. Secundum Tit. XIV, n. 533 and 534) suggests for the promulgation and enforcing of the ecclesiastical laws intended to bind the churches of the United States together in a common discipline, according to the pattern of the Roman Mother Church, must be allowed as often out of the reach of the bishops and clergy. The means laid down by the Council are:

1. Episcopal visitations.
2. Diocesan (and Provincial) Synods.
3. Ecclesiastical Conferences in cities and country.
4. Special instruction regarding the Decrees of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore in the theological seminaries.[1]

1 "Monemus episcopos, ut nullum non moveant lapidem, in Visitatione nempe Diœceesis, atque in Synodis tam Diœcesanis quam Provincialibus, necnon in coetibus sacerdotum pro disciplinarum theologicarum discussione, quatenus in omnibus executioni mandentur hujus Plenarii Concilii Decreta . . . Demum, quo melius ad omnium nostrorum sacerdotum notitiam perveniant, efficaciusque in praxim deducantur hujus Plenarii Concilii Decreta, statuimus ista, postquam a S. Sede recognita in lucem edita fuerint, in scholis nostris Juris Canonici ac Theologiae, quasi norma quaedam adhibeantur, quam in docendo Professores explicent et sequantur, alumnique omnes diligenter ac accurate addiscant."—Tit. XIVConc. Penl. Baltim. Secundi.

In order that the proper application of these means might lead to some definite results and serve as a guide in future legislation, or indicate the need of such exemptions and modifications as the Holy See might deem advisable to grant for the common and individual good of the different dioceses, the S. Congregation provided a schedule of fifty-five questions which the Ordinaries were to answer in writing and transmit periodically to Rome. These answers were designed to indicate the actual condition of the diocese and the amount of progress made, when possible, towards carrying out the ecclesiastical laws, within a limited period of time. Each bishop was moreover requested to assign specific reasons for any default in the exact observance of the canons, and to suggest such means as in his judgment were calculated to remedy existing evils.

We give these questions here, because they show how thoroughly Rome understood the difficulties with which our missionary bishops had to contend. Later legislation, to which we shall refer under special topics in subsequent articles on this subject, still more emphasize this wise conservatism allied to the steady intention of carrying out the ancient discipline of the Church under wholly new conditions of social and political life.

XVI. QUAESTIONES

Pro relatione ad S. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide.

(Ad. Titulum XIV., num. 534.)

1. Exprimantur nomen, aetas, patria Episcopi, et etiam institutum, si sit Regularis.

2. Amplitudo, et qualitas Diœcesis.

3. In qua Provincia sit, vel quot Provincias contineat.

4. Si Ecclesia sit Archiepiscopalis, quot, et quales habeat Suffraganeos; si vero Episcopalis, cujus Archiepiscopi sit Suffraganea.

5. An habeat Cathedralem, et propriam residentiam, et in quâ Civitate?

6. An Episcopus, habeat facultates speciales a S. Sede, et quas?

7. An habeat redditus proprios, quot, et in quo consistant?

8. Enumerentur loca Diœcesis, et eorum respectiva distantia.

9. Quando Visitatio Diœcesis fuerit peracta, num ad tramites praescriptionum canonicarum?

10. Quando Prov. ac Diœc. Synodi fuerint habitae?

11. An pro exercitio jurisdictionis aliqua inferatur molestia ab Episcopis finitimis?

12. An habeat Capitulum, et ex quot Canonicis constet?

13. An adsint Praebendae, et quae?

14. Quale servitium praestent Canonici Cathedrali: et an etiam fungantur munere Parochi in locis Diœcesis?

15. An resideant intra fines Parochiae?

16. An se immisceant in regimine Ecclesiae, impediant liberam jurisdictionem Episcopi?

17. An habeat Seminarium, et ubi: quot Juvenes ibidem alantur, et quibus studiis vacent?

18. Num Concilii Trid. regulae circa Seminaria serventur?

19. An ibi adsint Parochi, vel tantummodo simplices Missionarii?

20. An Parochi sint perpetui, vel ad nutum amovibiles, et an Missam celebrent festis diebus pro populo?

21. An eligantur ab Episcopo?

22. Quot sint Parochiae: an in eis servetur Sacrosancta Eucharistia, et cum quâ decentia?

23. An habeant fines certos, et propriam Ecclesiam: et quot Capellae inveniantur in districtu uniuscujusque Parochiae?

24. An aliquae Parochiae sint addictae Ordinibus Regularibus, et quibus?

25. An Parochi habeant Sacerdotes, qui eos adjuvent in cura animarum?

26. Exprimatur numerus, et qualitas Catholicorum in singulis quibusque locis degentium.

27. An sint et quo numero scholae Catholicae, et quot in iis instituantur?

28. An adsit Doctrina Christiana in lingua vernacula expurgata ab omni errore? et quatenus negative.

29. An sint et quo numero scholae acatholicorum, et num Catholici et quo numero illas adeant?

30. Exprimatur numerus Sacerdotum indigenarum, et exterorum.

31. Eorum patria, mores, munera, in quibus se exercent, et cujus utilitatis sint pro servitio Ecclesiae.

32. An hujusmodi Sacerdotes facultates habeant a Sede Apostolica, et cujus expensis vivant?

33. An inter istos inveniantur Alumni Sacr. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide: quinam sint: et an satisfaciant muneri suo?

34. Exprimantur etiam nomen, aetas, et qualitates Sacerdotum indigenarum, qui sunt extra Diœcesim; tum etiam adnotentur loca, in quibus morantur; quid ibi peragant; et an ex aliquo peculiari titulo teneantur inservire propriae Ecclesiae?

35. An sint etiam Clerici, et quot; quomodo, et ad quem titulum ordinentur; ubi resideant; et quid ab illis exigatur, ut ad Sacros Ordines promoveri possint?

36. An adsint Missionarii Regulares, quot, cujus Ordinis, et cujus Regionis?

37. An cuilibet Ordini sint assignati certi Districtus; et quâ auctoritate?

38. Ubi resideant, quibus Superioribus subsint, et quot habeant domos?

29. An habeant Conventus formatos, vel dumtaxat Hospitia; et in iis servetur Clausura?

40. An in communi vivant, et cum regulari observantia, vel habitent soli, et in domibus privatis cum saecularibus; et praecipue cum mulieribus?

41. In quo habitu incedant?

42. An admittant ad habitum, et professionem sui Ordinis indigenas, et quâ auctoritate?

43. An Regulares habeant facultates speciales; et an eas exhibeant Episcopo, antequam exerceant?

44. In quibus dependeant ab Episcopis?

45. Quibus mediis sustententur; an aliquid pro Sacramentorum administratione percipiant, et quae sit illorum fama?

46. An, et in quibus utile opus praestent pro salute animarum, et pro incremento Religionis?

47. An sit aliquis Monialium Conventus; cujus Instituti; quâ auctoritate fundatus; et cujus curae et ministerio subsit?

48. An ibidem observetur vita communis, et an Moniales obstringantur votis solemnibus Paupertatis, Castitatis, Obedientiae; et Clausura?

49. An sint in Diœcesi piae aliquae Fundationes, seu Legata Pia?

50. An redditus pro hujusmodi Legatis rite administrentur et Canones ea de re serventur?

51. Enumerentur omnes abusus, qui forte irrepserint etiam inter Catholicos, sive circa Fidem, et Ritus, sive circa mores, vel administrationem Sacramentorum, Divini Verbi praedicationem, et cujusque alterius generis sint.

52. Exprimantur principales causae hujusmodi abusuum, et quomodo possint eradicari.

53. Num matrimonia rite contrahantur?

54. An a viginti circiter annis status Fidei Catholicae augeatur, vel potius decrescat: et quâ de causa?

55. Tandem attente perpendat spirituales Christianitatis illius necessitates; eas distincte referat; mediaque proponat idonea ad praeteritos errores evellendos, et majorem Religionis profectum inducendum.

In referring to the principal difficulty which hinders the uniform observance of the Decrees enacted by the Second and Third Plenary Councils of Baltimore, it is also to be observed that the same has ceased to exist in many places where ten or even five years ago it furnished a valid excuse for the non-observance of the Decrees. It is not within our right to note here details and localities, but it is a fact plain to any who choose to see that the facilities of railway travel and other means of communication between distant bodies of the clergy have in recent years increased to an extent which very much lessens the reasons of omitting regular episcopal visitations, of bringing together the deans, of having periodically conferences for the clergy in the separate districts of a large diocese.

Moreover the increase of theological schools and diocesan seminaries, the establishment of official channels of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, and the facilities of the press and postal service generally, reduce the real difficulties of obtaining uniformity in matters of Church discipline to a minimum. Fortunately most of those districts in which the advantages of ready intercommunication are not so easily obtained are under the control of religious orders, whose devoted members supply by their spirit of religious co-operation those wants which lie naturally beyond the power of individuals among the secular clergy.

Since, then, our facilities have on the whole increased, it will be, no doubt, of advantage to review at this time the special legislation by which we are governed. An exact and all-sided knowledge of the law is the first condition of its proper observance, and we are assured that the discussion of the theme in these pages will lead to good results, not only because the REVIEW is spread and read in every part of the United States, but also because it offers opportunities of clearing up doubtful points which have arisen from a change of conditions since the publication of the Decrees.

In explaining particularly the *Decreta* of the last Council we shall of course take into account the *Acta*, inasmuch as these throw light upon the reasons and the process of development which led to the formulating of the Decrees. In this connection it may be well to observe that a Decree, as the term is here used, differs from a law or a precept in the ordinary sense, by reason of its greater binding force. Hence the ordinance of an individual bishop, if contrary to the Decrees, has no authority and would always be annulled in cases of appeal to a higher executive. The reason of this is that the Decrees are the result of the Acts, or, in other words, the outcome of combined deliberation of many authorities, to which individual authority is obliged to yield. Moreover a Decree has perpetual binding force until expressly revoked or superseded by a contrary Decree of the same authority. "*Decretum* jurisperitis est, quod praevia deliberatione ac causa cognita statuitur perpetuo valiturum . . . Decreta conciliorum gravioris auctoritatis esse censentur, quam constitutiones singularium magistratuum ; quia ex utriusque juris doctrina propter concursum multarum sententiarum praesumuntur pleniori maturitate praeparata majorique pondere confecta." (Nilles *Propylaea*, pag. 13.)

CLERICAL STUDIES.

XXXI.

CHURCH HISTORY (III.)

Later Studies.

THE work done in our seminaries on Church History is very limited; nor can it be otherwise, considering the narrow space that is grudgingly allowed it. Yet it suffices to introduce the subject to the attention of students and to awaken their interest. A vast and varied landscape has been spread out before them, of which they remember only the general impression and more salient features; but that is more than enough to make them desirous of going over the ground at leisure and visiting in detail what seemed most attractive. To something of the kind almost every young priest looks forward as he enters on the work of the ministry, and indeed there are few subjects, if any, from which he justly expects to derive more profit or more pleasure. We may add that there are none of more abiding interest, none whose attractiveness grows more steadily with increasing knowledge or loses less with advancing years.

But in order to preserve its full usefulness and charm the study has to be limited. Church History is too vast a region to be explored with care by any single mind, especially by one engaged with many things besides. It is for each one to single out what suits him best, that is, what meets best the requirements of his position and surroundings, or corresponds most completely with his turn of mind. As a fact, it is in following one or other of these indications that most students strike out on some special lines; and perhaps the best thing a beginner can do, if undecided, is to feel around him in various directions until he has found what interests him most, and keep to it. Yet even to such it may not be unwelcome to find a brief indication of the courses that are commonly followed, and to this we mean to devote the present paper.

I.

PERIODS.

There is, first of all, such a thing as selecting a special period and getting a thorough knowledge of it. Like all history, that of the Church divides itself naturally into a certain number of epochs, each having its characteristic features and its special interest.

1. At all times the early ages of the Church have possessed a special attraction. To the student of Church History they presented the spectacle of primitive Christianity uncontaminated by later evils. It was the heroic age of the Church, the glorious era of the martyrs, crowned by the conquest of the world to Christ. The great upheaval of the sixteenth century added fresh interest to the subject; Protestants at first agreeing with Catholics to consider these early times as a period of uncorrupted faith, to be studied, consequently, with special care in order to ascertain the original teaching of Christ and of the Apostles. Later on the controversial interest of the study became less, many Protestants declining to be bound by anything but the "Word of God." But many more remained faithful to the original conception, and so, for them as for Catholics, the early ages retain all their importance and all their attractiveness.

2. Yet Catholic students have turned more recently and in still greater numbers to mediæval times. The "dark ages," as they were called, long passed over as unworthy of notice or spoken of only with contempt, proved, when studied more closely, one of the most stirring, striking, eventful and poetic periods of all history; a period of great thoughts and heroic deeds, when the barbarous hordes which had overrun Europe centuries before, now won to the faith and moulded by the strong yet gentle hand of the Church, stood forth a new and noble type of manhood; when all bowed unquestioningly to the truths of the Gospel and to the authority of the Popes; the "ages of faith," the era of the Crusades, the era of Doctors and of Saints, so eloquently described by Montalembert in his introduction to the Life

of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, and in terms not less tender and touching by the positivist, Frederic Harrison in his essay on the connection of History.

3. To many the period of the Renaissance and of the Reformation is the most attractive of all ; a time of universal upheaval—political, literary, religious—such, perhaps, as the world never witnessed before ; a leavening of society by new principles and new forces, and a general overflow of pent-up life, with consequences which are deeply and universally felt to the present day.

4. But it is not to those more exciting epochs that the majority of students turn in our times. It is not the bright and brilliant periods of Church History that attract them ; it is the obscure beginnings of what subsequently grew into greatness. Indeed, in every sphere of investigation, one of the most marked tendencies of the present is to trace things back to their very inception. Whatever has life and growth is followed up to its earliest and humblest beginnings. The original germ and the first differentiation of parts concentrate the attention and absorb the interest of the biologist ; he cares less for what has assumed its definite forms. In like manner, the historian of to-day aims chiefly at reaching the primeval facts and conditions in which the great movements of subsequent times originated.

Thus, what is investigated with especial eagerness in early Church History is its very beginnings ;—the organization of the new society, not such as it is seen in the third or fourth centuries, but as it stood in the lifetime of the Apostles or in the following generation ;—the doctrines of Christianity, not as they stand out in the writings of Ambrose or Augustine, but as they were understood by the first disciples of the Gospel.

In the same way there are those who bestow more care on the earlier and less striking portion of the Middle Ages than on what follows, because in the former they find at their birth all the hidden forces which led in due time to great events. Or, again, they turn with keen interest to the dull and degenerate times comprised within the fourteenth and

fifteenth centuries, in order to watch the slow accumulation of elements whose explosion shook the world in the following age.

Thus it happens that there is scarcely a single portion of Church History that may not offer a lively interest to the careful investigator. But the subject lends itself to many other divisions and limitations, and one of the principal is that of the—

II.

GREAT HISTORIC MOVEMENTS.

The History of the Church, like that of the nations, is chiefly composed of a certain number of religious movements which originate, develop and pursue their course for years or for ages, sometimes independently, more often mingling together or uniting with secular forces, or crossing and counteracting each other like the great ocean currents. Such, to give some examples, was the wonderful diffusion of the Gospel from the beginning and its irresistible progress through ages of persecution. Such, later on, the pacific conquest of the Roman Empire, the subjugating of the barbarians to the yoke of Christ; or, again, the great missionary work of the two or three last centuries. Such may we consider the origin and growth of the temporal power of the popes, or the social and political authority which they wielded, with varying efficacy, through the Middle Ages. Such the Crusades; the development of the Religious Orders; the great doctrinal movements, from the Arianism of the fourth century to the Rationalism of the nineteenth; in particular the great revolt against Church authority, the Protestant Reformation, whose history, in Germany, in France, in England, Scotland and Ireland, offers some of the most important chapters to be found in all the annals of the past. There are many similar streams of collective life running through the whole field of Church History, all most interesting to follow; aspects of Christianity, dogmatic, moral, social, political,—even artistic and literary. It is easy

to see how each one of these may become the object of a special and most captivating study.

III.

GREAT HISTORICAL CHARACTERS.

It is a debated question among speculative writers how much or how little, in the course of public events, is due to individual action. But it can hardly be doubted that, equally in Church and State, the individual character of a few has impressed itself deeply on their contemporaries—sometimes on subsequent generations; and it is clear to all that, in our conception of the past, there are a certain number of leading figures around whose action and thought all the rest seems to gather itself, so that to know any of them is to know the period to which he belongs, or at least what is best worth knowing in it. Indeed, the individual can himself be properly understood only if seen amid his real surroundings; hence the custom among modern biographers to join to the history of their personages that of the period to which they belonged,—"a history of the life and times," as it is called, in which the times are, as it were, the background on which the portrait of the man stands out.

Much of what is most valuable in Church History comes to us to-day in this shape. Biography demands detail, and it is detail that gives life. Through it we get the truest and most vivid pictures of the past, and what, besides, is best remembered. A limited number of well-chosen lives—of great popes, of great leaders of thought or action, of great Saints—will give, in the most entertaining shape, not indeed a full knowledge of the facts of history, but an impression of the past in its different periods, more striking and more true than can always be gathered from ponderous tomes and lengthened study.

IV.

PROBLEMS.

Side by side with the authentic documents, the ascertained facts and unquestioned conclusions of Ecclesiastical

History, there are many others regarding which believers and unbelievers, Catholics and Protestants, Catholics themselves,—sometimes even the most enlightened and the most sincere,—are divided. Of such points the great majority appeal only to specialists; yet some remain, in every age of the Church's history, which are of interest, occasionally of the deepest interest, to the general reader. Those especially whose mission it is to represent the Church among their fellow-men and to defend her, cannot remain strangers to what may in any degree affect her good name. Thus such questions as the deposition of sovereigns, the Inquisition, Galileo, the character of certain popes, etc., call on their part for a thorough investigation. But irrespective of all controversy, there are countless questions connected with the Church's doctrines, her institutions, her influence and action, her great men and the like, which cannot but awaken the liveliest interest in the mind of a priest and make him strive, so far as he can, to ascertain the exact truth.

V.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

But where, it will be naturally asked, can he find information on all these subjects? Surely a large historical library would scarce suffice to meet all the requirements of the work suggested in the foregoing pages.

It is true; but then no single individual is supposed to take it all upon himself. The notion is, on the contrary, that each one shall confine himself to a comparatively small portion of it, and if he do, a very limited number of volumes, judiciously selected, will be found to suffice. We cannot be expected here to give an indication of the best books connected with the many questions referred to. Most of the latter have a special group of their own, while dealt with also in works of a general character. Unhappily much of the literature is found only in languages such as German or French, of which only a minority of the clergy have a

practical knowledge, or in Latin which, though understood, of course, by all, is read with pleasure by comparatively few. Yet the interest of the subjects is well calculated to make some at least overcome the difficulties of the languages through which the best information is accessible. Besides, some of the most valuable books have been translated into English, so that without going outside that tongue a considerable amount of information may still be reached on most points of interest.

On the whole question of books we gladly refer the reader to the valuable list given by Rev. A. Dowling in a former number (August, 1895) of this REVIEW. Whatever direction is taken, whatever choice made, it has always to be remembered that in the matter of history the almost universal trend of the modern mind leads back to a study of the

VI.

ORIGINAL SOURCES.

A certain knowledge of them is, consequently, of greater necessity now than at any previous period. No student is supposed to have investigated with care any portion or any question of history unless he has made himself acquainted in some measure with the earliest documents and authorities on the subject. He must know what they are and of what value; he must have acquired some direct knowledge of them—the fuller the better, and always enough to lead him back to them on points of doubt or difficulty.

For the first ten or twelve centuries Migne's *Latin Fathers* and any general collection of Councils will be found to contain most of what is serviceable in that regard. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius can hardly be called an original source; yet it may be considered as such, not only because it is the oldest work of the kind we possess, but also because it is in a great measure composed of textual quotations from primitive documents, so that it is principally to this invaluable work that we are indebted for what we know of the early history of the Church. No student should fail to read

fifteenth centuries, in order to watch the slow accumulation of elements whose explosion shook the world in the following age.

Thus it happens that there is scarcely a single portion of Church History that may not offer a lively interest to the careful investigator. But the subject lends itself to many other divisions and limitations, and one of the principal is that of the—

II.

GREAT HISTORIC MOVEMENTS.

The History of the Church, like that of the nations, is chiefly composed of a certain number of religious movements which originate, develop and pursue their course for years or for ages, sometimes independently, more often mingling together or uniting with secular forces, or crossing and counteracting each other like the great ocean currents. Such, to give some examples, was the wonderful diffusion of the Gospel from the beginning and its irresistible progress through ages of persecution. Such, later on, the pacific conquest of the Roman Empire, the subjugating of the barbarians to the yoke of Christ; or, again, the great missionary work of the two or three last centuries. Such may we consider the origin and growth of the temporal power of the popes, or the social and political authority which they wielded, with varying efficacy, through the Middle Ages. Such the Crusades; the development of the Religious Orders; the great doctrinal movements, from the Arianism of the fourth century to the Rationalism of the nineteenth; in particular the great revolt against Church authority, the Protestant Reformation, whose history, in Germany, in France, in England, Scotland and Ireland, offers some of the most important chapters to be found in all the annals of the past. There are many similar streams of collective life running through the whole field of Church History, all most interesting to follow; aspects of Christianity, dogmatic, moral, social, political,—even artistic and literary. It is easy

to see how each one of these may become the object of a special and most captivating study.

III.

GREAT HISTORICAL CHARACTERS.

It is a debated question among speculative writers how much or how little, in the course of public events, is due to individual action. But it can hardly be doubted that, equally in Church and State, the individual character of a few has impressed itself deeply on their contemporaries—sometimes on subsequent generations; and it is clear to all that, in our conception of the past, there are a certain number of leading figures around whose action and thought all the rest seems to gather itself, so that to know any of them is to know the period to which he belongs, or at least what is best worth knowing in it. Indeed, the individual can himself be properly understood only if seen amid his real surroundings; hence the custom among modern biographers to join to the history of their personages that of the period to which they belonged,—"a history of the life and times," as it is called, in which the times are, as it were, the background on which the portrait of the man stands out.

Much of what is most valuable in Church History comes to us to-day in this shape. Biography demands detail, and it is detail that gives life. Through it we get the truest and most vivid pictures of the past, and what, besides, is best remembered. A limited number of well-chosen lives—of great popes, of great leaders of thought or action, of great Saints—will give, in the most entertaining shape, not indeed a full knowledge of the facts of history, but an impression of the past in its different periods, more striking and more true than can always be gathered from ponderous tomes and lengthened study.

IV.

PROBLEMS.

Side by side with the authentic documents, the ascertained facts and unquestioned conclusions of Ecclesiastical

History, there are many others regarding which believers and unbelievers, Catholics and Protestants, Catholics themselves,—sometimes even the most enlightened and the most sincere,—are divided. Of such points the great majority appeal only to specialists; yet some remain, in every age of the Church's history, which are of interest, occasionally of the deepest interest, to the general reader. Those especially whose mission it is to represent the Church among their fellow-men and to defend her, cannot remain strangers to what may in any degree affect her good name. Thus such questions as the deposition of sovereigns, the Inquisition, Galileo, the character of certain popes, etc., call on their part for a thorough investigation. But irrespective of all controversy, there are countless questions connected with the Church's doctrines, her institutions, her influence and action, her great men and the like, which cannot but awaken the liveliest interest in the mind of a priest and make him strive, so far as he can, to ascertain the exact truth.

V.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

But where, it will be naturally asked, can he find information on all these subjects? Surely a large historical library would scarce suffice to meet all the requirements of the work suggested in the foregoing pages.

It is true; but then no single individual is supposed to take it all upon himself. The notion is, on the contrary, that each one shall confine himself to a comparatively small portion of it, and if he do, a very limited number of volumes, judiciously selected, will be found to suffice. We cannot be expected here to give an indication of the best books connected with the many questions referred to. Most of the latter have a special group of their own, while dealt with also in works of a general character. Unhappily much of the literature is found only in languages such as German or French, of which only a minority of the clergy have a

practical knowledge, or in Latin which, though understood, of course, by all, is read with pleasure by comparatively few. Yet the interest of the subjects is well calculated to make some at least overcome the difficulties of the languages through which the best information is accessible. Besides, some of the most valuable books have been translated into English, so that without going outside that tongue a considerable amount of information may still be reached on most points of interest.

On the whole question of books we gladly refer the reader to the valuable list given by Rev. A. Dowling in a former number (August, 1895) of this REVIEW. Whatever direction is taken, whatever choice made, it has always to be remembered that in the matter of history the almost universal trend of the modern mind leads back to a study of the

VI.

ORIGINAL SOURCES.

A certain knowledge of them is, consequently, of greater necessity now than at any previous period. No student is supposed to have investigated with care any portion or any question of history unless he has made himself acquainted in some measure with the earliest documents and authorities on the subject. He must know what they are and of what value; he must have acquired some direct knowledge of them—the fuller the better, and always enough to lead him back to them on points of doubt or difficulty.

For the first ten or twelve centuries Migne's *Latin Fathers* and any general collection of Councils will be found to contain most of what is serviceable in that regard. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius can hardly be called an original source; yet it may be considered as such, not only because it is the oldest work of the kind we possess, but also because it is in a great measure composed of textual quotations from primitive documents, so that it is principally to this invaluable work that we are indebted for what we know of the early history of the Church. No student should fail to read

it, and if, as is likely, he thereby contracts a happy taste for getting things at first hand, he can indulge it with little trouble and much profit, right through the subsequent ages. Thus Sozomen or Theodoret (both to be had in English as well as Eusebius) will carry him through the fifth century. In the correspondence of St. Gregory the Great he will get a wonderful insight into the condition of the Church and the Empire a hundred years later, while for the same period he will find, in the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, a striking picture of the barbarians emerging, under the hand of the Church, into civilized life. In the following century Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* will introduce him to the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and Eginhard's *Vita et gesta Caroli Magni* will supply a lifelike portrait of the person and times of the great Christian Emperor whose history is substantially identified with that of the Church during his lengthened reign.

In the following ages contemporary records abound—biographies, chronicles, monastic annals, memoirs, etc. To have read any of them is to get an impression of the period to which they belong and with it a power of appreciating characters and events, such as can scarce be obtained in any other way.

In this connection there are two original sources of Ecclesiastical History which should not remain unmentioned—the *Acta Sanctorum*, or great Bollandist collection of the lives of the Saints, begun upwards of two hundred years ago and still unfinished, and the *Collections of the Councils.* Their ponderous tomes are, indeed, at first sight, very uninviting; but nobody thinks of reading them all, and on the other hand, it is almost impossible to look into them with any care and fail to be captivated by their contents. It is like visiting a museum of Ancient or mediæval art, or walking through the unearthed city of Pompeii and gathering from its ruins the picture of a great civilization long lost and but faintly reflected in our own.

But we must not be understood as saying that these early documents are to be found only in the great collections or

ancient books of which we have spoken. The aim of most modern historians is to give them as great a space as possible in their narratives. There is no room for them in our manuals; but our chief ecclesiastical histories, such as Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Fleury, Rohrbacher, etc., are largely made up of them. No writer has contributed more to beget a love of the Ancient Church and her monuments than Fleury in his lengthened but never tedious narrative. Indeed he carried the love of antiquity to a fault, every departure from it being considered by him as a sign of decay. This, with a constant concern to limit the power of the popes and to exalt that of temporal sovereigns, give a bias to the whole work. Rohrbacher's History is a great book, but not always reliable. Still less is that of Abbé Darras. Like Rohrbacher he makes the mistake of starting from the creation of the world, and relating the history of the chosen people—a subject which can be properly handled only by Bible scholars. Like Rohrbacher, too, he is one-sided, holding a brief right through for the popes and for all ecclesiastical action, and too often disposed to explain away, or minimize, or deny what is not in harmony with his preferences or seems less creditable to the Church.

We still await an entirely satisfactory history of the Church. Can it at any time be hoped for? Can a single mind be ever expected to grasp so vast a subject? Can any man so entirely divest himself of his own preferences and prejudices as to see always the real past and describe as he sees it? Or, compelled as he must be to take many things at second hand, will he always trust the right authorities, and will not his very impartiality, if he attain to it, reduce his work to a cold, soulless, uninviting statement of events?

It is because they are sensible to all this that so many at the present day strive to get behind even the larger and more reliable histories, and accept nothing of importance without verifying it themselves. Yet they are not the less ready to acknowledge their indebtedness to historians, as supplying the necessary framework as well as numberless details in which they are entirely reliable.

VII.

NON-CATHOLIC WRITERS.

Finally, in a country like this the study would not be complete without some knowledge of the subject as presented by Protestant writers. In anything like habitual intercourse with those outside the Church the facts of her history are constantly coming up, and are frequently made a matter of discussion. To be prepared for it, the priest has to know other versions of things as well as his own, and where can he find them better than in the favorite historians of his opponents?

Of these it will suffice here to mention a few.

The first is Gibbon. With all its blemishes *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* is one of the greatest historical works ever written. In the vastness of its proportions, its prodigious mastery of details, clear conception when not blinded by irreligious prejudice, in its condensed thought and magnificent diction, it remains unsurpassed, not to say unequalled, in its special sphere. It is still widely read, not only as a classic of the English language, but as a most graphic picture of Church and State during more than a thousand years. No special student of controversial history can remain a stranger to it.

The second is the *History of Christianity* and the *History of Latin Christianity* by Dean Milman. His corrective notes on the *Decline and Fall* of Gibbon had prepared him for, and possibly suggested to him, an original work on almost the same subject. As a fact he covers nearly the same ground, tells substantially the same story, his chief personages are the same; but the purpose is different, that of Gibbon being to recount the decline and fall of the Empire, that of Milman to describe the rise and growth of the Church. But he does it all as a Protestant of a somewhat sceptical disposition might be expected to do it. His opposition to the Catholic Church has made him, as well as his brilliant literary powers, a favorite author among Protestants; his judgments are for the most part accepted without question; it behooves

consequently the Catholic student of history to make himself acquainted with his very able work.

The third is the voluminous and able *History of the Christian Church* by Dr. Schaff, generally as fair as could be expected.

The last we would mention is *A History of the Christian Church*, by Professor Fisher of Yale. In a single volume the learned writer presents, naturally from the Protestant standpoint, the main facts of the Church's history—a most convenient means for the Catholic student to know how Protestants generally view them.

From what has been said it is easy to see in how many ways Church history may continue to be cultivated by a priest, even in the spare hours of a busy ministry. It is incredible how much may be done if the labor is persevered in steadily for a certain number of years. To those who proceed thus helps come of themselves, fresh sources of information are ever opening up; historical articles or addresses, discoveries, books old and new—each stimulating the mind to fresh thought and more eager research. It is well that in view of all these opportunities the mind should not be fixed exclusively on any one aspect of things. To keep alive to all sides of a question and to all manner of questions, besides broadening and strengthening, enriches with all that is best in what one handles. Books teach not so much in proportion to their intrinsic value as to the receptivity of the reader, and receptivity means openness and reflection. With a few books Abbé Gorini became a historian; but his open and reflective mind took in all he read and assimilated it all. By cultivating the same mental qualities there are hundreds of priests through the land who, without adding a dozen volumes to their libraries, could win a place scarcely less honorable in the field of history.

J. HOGAN.

St. John's Seminary, Boston.

THE PONTIFICAL DECLARATION OF THE INVALIDITY OF ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.[1]

I.

EARLY in October, 1896, we published the text of the Pontifical Bull in which Leo XIII, after a long and mature examination,[2] confirming the decrees of his predecessors, *motu proprio*, *certa scientia*, pronounced and declared that "the Ordinations performed according to the Anglican Rite have been and are entirely invalid and absolutely null."[3]

This solemn and definitive decision, which was looked for by many persons, and feared by some, has evoked, as was to be expected, various comments in England. English Catholics welcomed it with one accord and with sincere expressions of satisfaction and gratitude. It was a great consolation to all, but especially to converts from Anglicanism, who, having renounced their error, had returned, within late years, to the full and perfect obedience of the Roman Pontiff, in the one true fold of Christ.[4] The false and painful position in which recent polemics tended to place them is now at an end; the Bull of Leo XIII, whilst it justifies their position, encourages them anew and spurs them on to make further noble endeavors in behalf of those of their countrymen who are still separated from the centre of Catholic unity. The *Tablet*, of London, the authoritative interpreter of the English Catholics, speaks of the Pontifical Bull as follows: "In presence of this utterance of the Holy See our first duty is to record the expression of our filial gratitude to

1 From the Italian in the *Civiltà Cattolica* (S. M. Brandi, S. J.) vol. viii, Quad. 1113 and 1114.

2 The leading details of this examination, referred to by the Holy Father at the beginning of this Bull, may be found in our *Cronaca Contemporanea* (Cose Romane) *Civiltà Cattolica*, Quad. 1113, p. 227.

3 *Pronuntiamus et declaramus ordinationes ritu anglicano actas, irritas prorsus fuisse et esse, ominnoque nullas.*

4 Since the conversion of Doctor, afterwards Cardinal, Newman (1845), down to our own time, more than 500 members of the Anglican clergy have returned to the Catholic Church.

the Vicar of Christ for the paternal zeal with which he has graciously undertaken the settlement of this grave and far-reaching issue; for the conscientious care and thoroughness which he has brought to bear upon its investigation; for the charity and equity which he has breathed into every stage of its proceedings; and last, but not least, for the truly apostolic singleness of purpose and unfaltering clearness with which he has given to the world his supreme and final judgment. We are confident that the gratitude which we feel towards the Holy Father for thus setting at rest a much vexed question will be shared not only by the Catholics of England, and of the English-speaking countries, but, in its measure, by the whole Catholic world."[1] The Catholic Congress held at Hanley, presided over by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, echoed the sentiments of the *Tablet* at its first session, held September 28, when, amid the acclamations of all present, it proposed a vote of thanks to the Holy Father for the reasons assigned.

The so-called *secular* press, also, as a whole, received the papal document with respectful consideration, not only publishing the full text, but commenting on it, and candidly confessing that those who believe and accept the Catholic doctrine must also accept the conclusion of the Pope. The *Times* in particular expresses its grateful appreciation of the Holy Father's words, and praises him for his sincerity and moderation and for the clearness and precision of the language which he uses. "Henceforth," it says, "it is evident that he who desires to be Catholic and to have the sacraments, as Catholics understand them, with all the supernatural powers of the priesthood, must be united and subject to Rome. The *via media* invented by some, and the union fancied by others, without the submission to the jurisdiction of Rome, are things to be despised. Better thus. *We Englishmen have never pretended to have valid orders in the sense of the Pope*, that is, such as confer the mysterious powers of the Catholic priesthood. Let us remain, therefore, what we were."

1 *Tablet*, September 26, page 484. See also the *Month*, October, page 153.

II.

Protestant Englishmen of the Erastian school, who, in fact, constitute the majority of the members of the Anglican church, have spoken and written in the same vein. Even these, pretending to a certain indifference for the new papal document, admit that its publication is a certain satisfaction, and that they rejoice to find themselves in accord with the Pope in maintaining a truth without doubt attested by history, that is to say, "that it was the firm and explicit intention of the English Reformers of the XVI century to entirely and absolutely exclude from their churches the priesthood and the Catholic sacrifice." Listen, for example, what the *Rock*,[1] the organ of this school, says on the subject: "The Pope has spoken on the question of Anglican Ordinations with a promptness and determination which many did not expect. . . . We are fully in accord with the Pope in this matter, and we can subscribe to almost all his arguments. It is precisely what we have always held, namely, that by the Reformation the heads of the Church of England deliberately and effectively separated from the Church of Rome, repudiated her teaching on the Priesthood and on the Episcopacy, and therefore in the ordination they never had any intention of conferring the *Priesthood*, since they considered *Sacerdotalism* an injury to the Priesthood of Christ, without foundation in the Scriptures, and repugnant to all the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel." The *Western Times*,[2] of Exeter, in a remarkable article on the subject, in which it severely chastises certain Anglicans for their innovations attempting "to ape at any expense the Church of Rome," observes that the Pope in his Bull has said what he ought to say, that he shows his perfect knowledge of the true character of the English Reformation, and that from the very nature of the principles which she professes there does not and cannot exist in the English Church a *sacrificing priesthood*. The article concludes with these weighty words: "If

1 September 25, in an article entitled *Poor Lord Halifax*.

2 September 26.

any disastrous consequence must follow the publication of the pontifical Bull, the disaster will not fall upon the Church of Rome, but rather upon those who have estranged themselves from the principles of the Reformation."

Anglicans who profess the doctrines of this school are for the most part sincere in their belief, although they are imbued with the old prejudices against the Pope and the Church of Rome. To their praise it must be said that, in rejecting the Priesthood and the Sacrifice, they simply show themselves consistent with the principles on which their Church is founded. In fact, the Anglican community, in its XXXI Article of Faith, professes and teaches that "*the Sacrifices of Masses*, in the which it was commonly said, that *the Priest did offer Christ* for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, *were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.*"[1]

III.

We do not know whether to account it good fortune, or ill, that not all who call themselves Anglicans profess adhesion to this school. The fact is that there are Anglicans who, without being *Protestants* in the sense of their *confrères*, are nevertheless not *Catholics* as we are. An English prelate has aptly characterized this class, which he calls *Protestants in Catholic guise.* Their origin dates about sixty years back, when the so-called Oxford and Tractarian movements arose, and they are known to-day by the name *Ritualists.* They profess to accept in a qualified way the doctrines regarding the Priesthood, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and

1 "*Missarum Sacrificia*, quibus vulgo dicebatur *Sacerdotem offerre Christum* in remissionem poenae aut culpae pro vivis et defunctis, *blasphema figmenta sunt et perniciosae imposturae.*" (See *The Book of Common Prayer*, Oxford, 1880, p. 533.) The Latin translation from the English text of this book was made by Wm. Bright and P. Goldsmith Meed. A recent edition was published at London, 1890.—*Cardwell* (Annals, I, 241), asserts that from the very beginning of the Anglican Church the Bishop obliged the clergy to teach the people that "*the Mass* is not a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead."

the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Bl. Eucharist. We say, *in a qualified way*, because they do not understand these dogmas in the sense in which the Catholic Church has always understood them and understands them at present. The Sacrifice of the Mass is accepted by them only in the sense of a commemorative sacrifice; they teach indeed the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but they explain it in the Lutheran sense, in such a way as to admit some indefinable spiritual presence. They reject the leading Catholic doctrines of transsubstantiation, of the constitution of the Church, of the Primacy of jurisdiction lodged in the Roman Pontiff, and others. Nevertheless, they profess to believe that the supernatural life of the soul is produced, nourished and perfected by the sacraments, and that priests, who are the ministers of these sacraments, possess the power of consecrating, of sacrificing and of forgiving sins. Since this special power is recognized to depend essentially upon transmission through a valid succession in the Catholic Priesthood, we can readily understand why Ritualists have been so anxious to assure themselves of the validity of the Ordinations received in the Anglican Church.[1] Hence it happened that Anglicans have made repeated attempts to obtain recognition of their orders from the Greeks, the Jansenists of Holland, and recently from the "Old Catholics" of Germany;[2] but all their efforts have thus far proved futile. They deemed it, therefore, advisable to make overtures to the Holy See, under the specious pretext (devised with singular ingenuity by Lord Halifax, followed by a small contingent of

1 The Benedictine D. Bede Camm, formerly an Anglican clergyman, in an article (see *Revue Bénédictine*, Num. 12, December, 1894, page 536), remarks of Dr. Lee, a well known Anglican writer of recent date, that "cet auteur après avoir écrit un livre fort savant en faveur de ces ordres, en conçut un tel doute qu'il se fit donner en secret les ordres valides par un prélat janséniste, et fonda au sein de l'Eglise Anglicaine une société secrète qui administre à ses membres sous condition le baptême, la confirmation et l'ordre."

2 Camm publishes in his account the negative answer given to the Anglicans by the Congress of the Old Catholics, held at Rotterdam, September, 1894. (l. c. page 539.)

the Ritualist party,[1] that if the Roman Pontiff would recognize, even conditionally, the validity of these Orders, it would open a way for the possible union of the Anglican establishment with the Church of Rome.

IV.

That the solemn and definitive declaration of the invalidity of Anglican ordinations made by Leo XIII has proved a very disagreeable fact and a sore disappointment to these, is evident. With one blow the Pope has dissipated their cherished dream that the "Roman Branch" of the Catholic Church would ever recognize the sacraments of the "Anglican Branch" as being of equal validity and efficiency with her own. With this phantom has also disappeared the coveted Branch-theory, according to which the Church was to be considered *one* not by the unity of faith and government—as Leo XIII teaches in his Encyclical *Satis cognitum*—but by the unity of her sacraments, in which the divers and independent "sections," or national Churches, which divide her, are supposed to share. The disappointment which followed the express repudiation of this view on the part of the Sovereign Pontiff was all the more painful to the Ritualist party, since not only the leaders of the *Church Union*, but also some Catholic writers more zealous than discreet, had during the last two years fostered the hope that the decision would be favorable to the party.[2]

All this, though it may explain the disgust and irritation of which the Ritualist organs[3] have given evidence since the

1 The Archdeacon of London, W. Sinclair, attests that the number of Ritualists in England does not exceed 35,000. If this statement be true, they can hardly wield much influence, when we consider that there are in England 16,000,000 Anglicans.

2 Of these writers it is remarked in the Bull that they are *praeserlim non Angli*, and that, *documentis Apostolicae Sedis haud satis quam oportuerat cognitis disputationem de ea* (the validity of the Anglican ordinations) *libere habere non dubitarint.*

3 See *The Guardian* of September 23 and 30. This journal was one of those which, in the early part of 1896, in harmony with the sentiments of Dr. Lacey, "Father" Puller, and other Ritualists or abettors of the Ritualistic party, well known in Rome, extolled the wisdom, impartiality, breadth of view, etc , of the Holy Father.

publication of the Bull, will never excuse, much less justify, the offensive insinuations and openly false accusations by which they, and indeed also Lord Halifax, have sought to discredit the pontificial decision.[1]

To these insinuations and false statements we shall return in another part of this article; just here let us assure our dissenting brethren, as His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan did in his discourse at Hanley, that nothing but unquestionable evidence, urgent charity and a sense of strictest duty could have induced Leo XIII to pronounce his definitive judgment on the invalidity of the Anglican Ordinations. He has been placed by God, to govern His Church on earth, and as her supreme Head, infallible Teacher, chief Custodian of the Sacraments, he is the sole trusty guide along the paths so often rendered doubtful to our sense of truth and justice. Accountable to God, responsible for souls in the fulfillment of his office, he should have done wrong to leave in pernicious error so many of his children, who, although separated from him, sincerely seek the Kingdom of Christ in the unity of faith. In every case, but especially in the present, he has been urged to act alone by that solicitude and apostolic charity *by which*, as he says in the exordium of the Bull, *We endeavor to fulfil the office and follow in the footsteps of the Great Shepherd of the Sheep, Our Lord Jesus Christ.*[2]

V.

To understand the true force and significance of the apostolic letter of Leo XIII concerning Anglican Ordinations, it is necessary to review briefly the history of the schism which gave rise to the question.

Henry VIII was the first English monarch who constrained the clergy and people of a Church, which down to his time

1 See the text of Lord Halifax's *Letter* of September 28, addressed to the *Guardian* (Sept. 30), and of his *Discourse*, delivered at Shrewsbury, published by the *Tablet* (Oct. 10, pp. 574-575).

2 *Pastorem magnum ovium, Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum referre pro munere et imitari, aspirante eius gratia, studemus. Cf. Encycl.*

had been justly styled the *most noble member of the Apostolic See*,[1] to be separate from allegiance to the Chair of Peter. Henry VIII, having declared his opposition, in 1534, to Pope Clement VII, because the latter refused to grant him an illegitimate divorce, proclaimed himself Head of the Church of England, and obliged his subjects to swear allegiance to him as such.[2] That was the beginning of the Anglican Schism and of religious anarchy in England. The king confided the principal government of ecclesiastical affairs to Cromwell, a layman, who acted as his Vicar-General in spiritual matters. The principal Sees were held by or confided to Bishops who were known to be unsound in faith, and, in some cases, open supporters of Protestantism, whilst the preachers of the so-called Reformation were allowed to propagate everywhere their false teachings. Moreover, although it is incontestible, and two leading Anglican clergymen[3] openly admitted the fact during the recent in-

1 *Nobilissimum Sedis Apostolicae membrum. Epist. Gregorii IX ad Episcopos suffragneos Eccles. Cantuar.* Cf. *Matthew Paris, Historia Maior*, 1246. Ed. Paris, 1694, page 245.

2 Cf. *Act of Supremacy 26 Henry VIII*, cc. 1, 2, 3.

3 Dr. Lacey and "Father" Puller, after having wearied themselves in *enlightening* "the Curia" on the question of Anglican Ordinations, secretly published at Rome, last May, and distributed liberally among the Cardinals and Roman Prelates, their work entitled *De Re Anglicana*. Many errors having been found in it which might easily deceive those who were not acquainted with English affairs, it was thought necessary for the *sole* defense of truth to unmask them. This was admirably done by Canon J. Moyes and Dom. F. A. Gasquet, O.S.B., in their *Answer*, published under the date of "Rome, Feast of St. William, Archbishop of York, June 8, 1896." An English translation, dishonestly manipulated from the Italian, in which it was written, was published in England by the *Church Times* and the *Guardian*. In it the title of the *Answer*, which explains the occasion and the *sole* reason for which it was written, is omitted. Likewise the numerous quotations from the work *De Re Anglicana* are omitted in the text, thereby giving the English readers to understand that it is a *Promemoria* written by the enemies of the Union to deceive the Pope, and to wrest from him a condemnation of the Anglican Orders! Lord Halifax and the "Archbishop" of York, who certainly had both documents before them, did not hesitate to corroborate the deception by their authority, repeating the absurd tale.

vestigations at Rome, that under the schismatic Henry, who died January 28, 1547, certain shameful and deplorable occurrences took place,[1] nevertheless it is certain that during the first period of the Anglican Schism (1534–1547) the Catholic Liturgy was maintained intact, and the *usual form of the Church* in Sacred Ordinations was observed. Concerning the validity of these Ordinations, therefore, there can be no doubt, nor does the recent Bull of Leo XIII refer to them.

VI.

But Thomas Cranmer, the unworthy Archbishop of Canterbury, selected by Henry as the instrument to bring about the separation, was anxious to abolish in England the Catholic Liturgy and to introduce the formulas and religious practices of the Protestant sects of Germany, with the leaders of which he held regular and intimate correspondence. Being by the desire of the deceased sovereign second in the Council of the Regency of Edward VI, who succeeded his father on the throne at the age of scarcely nine years, Cranmer took steps to accomplish his evil purpose. Among the new reforms of importance which he presented for approval to Parliament[2] the most serious were the suppression of the *Missal*, which was to give place to an *Office of Protestant Communion* and the institution of a *new* rite, called the *Ordinal*, to be followed in the sacred Ordinations instead of the ancient Catholic *Pontifical* used previously in the Church of England for many centuries.

We have called the *Ordinal* a "new" rite (and so it is called in the Bull: *novus plane ritus*) because in reality, abandoning the rite of the Roman Pontifical, the compilers of the *Ordinal* did not wish, nor could they consistently accept any of the ancient rites which the Catholic Church considered

1 "Quaedam (multa?) facinorosa, quaedam adhuc ploranda evenerunt." —In the work cited, page 1.

2 The Missal was suppressed by an act of Parliament January 15, 1549. The *Ordinal* which was to take the place of the Pontifical, was approved in 1550. The revision of the new Liturgy was made in 1552. See *Dom Gasquet, Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 261 and fol.

valid. The reason of this is evident from the scope which they proposed to follow, that is, to exclude from the Anglican Liturgy all *sacerdotalism* and every vestige of the Catholic doctrine concerning the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Now, if they deliberately rejected the rite prescribed in the Pontifical precisely because it abounded in formulas and ceremonies which asserted, supposed or signified the Priesthood, the Real Presence and the Sacrifice, they were also bound to reject the rites, for example, of the Greeks, of the Maronites, of the Nestorians, of the Jacobites of Alexandria, of the Armenians or of others[1] which, no less than the ancient and modern Roman rites, plainly profess the doctrine expressed by these same ideas.

Let us give here some of the characteristics of the *Anglican Ordinal* for conferring the Orders, such as are recognized by the Anglican Church, viz., Deaconship, Priesthood and the Episcopate.[2] In the *Ordinal*, as we have already mentioned, there is an utter absence of any term which indicates the sacerdotal power of consecrating and offering in sacrifice to God the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, really present under the species of bread and wine; there is no consecration of the candidate with the holy oils; indeed, not only is there no mention of any definite term or form indicating the bestowal of such powers, but all the ceremonies used by the Church to signify these same powers, such as the "handing (*traditio*) of the instruments," ex. gr. of the Chalice and Paten with the Host, in conferring Priesthood, are entirely omitted. The eucharistic, called consecrating, prayer itself, very ancient and common to all the rites, is, in the *Ordinal*, not only mutilated and changed, but altogether separated from the action of imposing hands, which is to give it its significance; it is recited simply as any other preparatory

1 For the Rites cited in the text consult *Assemani, Codex Liturgicus Eccles. Universae*, Tomes viii, ix, xi; *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Tome iii; *Morinus, De Sacris Ecclesiae Ordinationibus; Denziger, Ritus Orientalium; Duchesne, Origines du Culte Chrétien; Maskell, Monumenta Ritualia;* etc., etc.

2 The Anglicans reject Subdeaconship and the four Minor Orders.

prayer. Not one of the *new forms* used in the *Ordinal*[1] expresses the power or the Order which is to be conferred.

How much of this *Ordinal*, known as the *Ordinal of Edward VI*, came from the pen of Cranmer it is difficult to determine; but there can be no doubt that he procured its composition, that he introduced the *new forms*, and, together with his counsellors, desired that it should take the place of the *Pontifical* with the explicit, deliberate, heretical intention of excluding from the Anglican Church the Priesthood and the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Catholic sense.[2]

We need not remind our readers that when Anglican Orders are spoken of in this controversy, those only are meant which have been conferred and are conferred according to this *Ordinal*. And it is to these Orders alone that the Bull has reference when it declares that "Ordinations carried out according to the *Anglican rite* have been and are obsolutely null and utterly void."[3]

Another fact must be stated here, to which we shall be obliged to refer more than once in the following paragraphs, namely, that during the brief reign of Edward VI (1547–1553) the episcopal consecrations of Poynet, Hooper, Coverdale, Scory, Taylor and Harley were conducted in England according to the new *Ordinal*. This fact, which some have attempted to deny, is fully vouched for by history. The

1 We are speaking of the *Ordinal* as it passed from the hands of the first compilers. We shall afterwards see what modifications were introduced in 1662.

2 That Cranmer, no less than the other compilers of the *Ordinal*, formally rejected the Catholic belief is indisputable. Here is what he writes in his work *De Oblatione* (*lib V, cap 1.*): "Gravissima contumelia et iniuria quae inferri Christo potest, et per omne regnum Papisticum latissime patet, ea est quod *Sacerdotes Missam hostiam propitiantem esse asseverant*, ad remittenda non modo peccata sua, verum etiam aliorum, tum viventium tum mortuorum, quibus illam voluerint applicare. Ita, simulatione pietatis, papistici sacerdotes hoc sibi sumpserant, ut Christi successores essent, *ut huiusmodi sacrificium facerent, quale nullum umquam a quoquam, praeterquam a Christo ipso, factum est*, idque eo solum tempore, cum morte sua poenas peccatorum nostrorum in cruce lueret."

3 "Ordinationes *ritu anglico* actas irritas prorsus fuisse et esse, omninoque nullas."

documents and authentic manuscripts which stand in proof are recorded by Burnet, Fox, Estcourt and other English writers of equal authority.

VII.

At the death of Edward, July 6, 1553, his legitimate sister, Mary, was proclaimed Queen of England. She remained Catholic and faithful to the Apostolic See of Rome. From the day on which she ascended the throne, and as long as she lived, she endeavored by every means in her power to repair the damage done to religion by her father and her brother, and to lead England back to its former communion with the Roman Church. In this work Mary had the efficacious and enlightened co-operation of Cardinal Pole, sent thither by Julius III as Pontifical Legate with the most ample and necessary faculties. One of the first acts recorded in the reign of Mary was to remove, by the authority of the Legate, the above-mentioned six "bishops" from the Sees which they held, to do away with the new Liturgy and the *Ordinal* of Edward, and to resume the old Catholic Pontifical for all the sacred functions of the Ordinations.

To the first three years of the reign of Mary belong the four very important pontifical documents, cited by Leo XIII in his Bull. Of these, two are of Julius III and two of Paul IV, and they bear respectively the dates of August 5, 1553, March 8, 1554, June 20 and October 30, 1555. From all of them, as we shall show later, it is evident that the question of the validity of Anglical Ordinations was from that time seriously studied and decided upon, not only in their practical but also in their doctrinal bearing.

Unhappily, the reign of Queen Mary was even shorter than that of her brother Edward; she died in November, 1558, after having reigned five years and four months.

Elizabeth, illegitimate daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, succeeded Mary. She is accountable for the return of the unhappy days of schism and of heresy to which England has from that time been subject. Three months after the death of her sister, in February, 1559, she procured, by an Act of Parliament, the suppression of the

Roman Pontifical, and again introduced the new Liturgy and the *Ordinal* of Edward.

The Catholic bishops, who had been legitimately nominated and consecrated during the reign of Mary, were requested to take the oath of allegiance which had been enjoined by Henry and by Edward; they were to separate themselves from the centre of Catholic unity, established by Christ in the Church of Rome, and to deny the jurisdiction of the Holy See, whilst they were urged to recognize Elizabeth as the supreme head of the Church of England. If the remembrance of the cowardice of the numerous bishops who subjected themselves to the tyranny of Henry is painful, it is doubly consoling to know that among all the Catholic bishops living at the time of Elizabeth's accession there was only one traitor; all the others courageously suffered privation of their Sees, imprisonment and numberless other vexations.[1]

VIII.

With the reign of Elizabeth, the difficulties take new form. Anxious to see her schismatic church founded on *aristocratic* principles, she refrained from eliminating the distinction of hierarchical grades, although she was wholly indifferent as to whether the ministers of her ordaining had the sacramental character or not. Under these circumstances she nominated such candidates as she wished to place in the

1 In the *Registrum divèrsarum scripturarum Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, etc.*, kept in the secret archives of the Vatican, is found a letter addressed to Cardinal Morone which refers to those days. It says: In the kingdom of England there are at present twenty-seven Cathedral Churches, fifteen of which are vacant on account of the death of the Catholic bishops, who had legitimately taken possession of them by favor of the Apostolic See. The bishops of the remaining twelve Sees are still alive. Ten of them are in prison (the Tower of London), for their adherence to the Catholic faith and the authority of the Apostolic See, which they are resolved to obey and to rather suffer martyrdom than to recognize any other Head in the Church of God than the Pope. The other two are still alive; the Bishop of St. Asaph, who is attending the Council of Trent by order of His Holiness, and the Bishop of Llandaff, who has allowed himself to be seduced by the Queen of England, whom he obeys. Cf. *W. Maziere Brady, Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy*, Rome, 1877, page 4.

episcopal Sees which had been deprived of their legitimate pastors. Among these candidates was Matthew Parker, formerly chaplain of Anne Boleyn, destined for the primatial See of Canterbury. When it came to the question of consecrating him for the office, all the Catholic bishops refused to perform the ceremony, even Bishop Kitchen, who was the only one who had unscrupulously subscribed to the oath. In this perplexity, after having waited some time, Elizabeth issued a mandate of consecration, which was accepted by Coverdale and by three apostate brethren, Barlow, Scory and Hodgkins. Barlow had been nominated by Henry VIII Bishop of St. David's, in 1536, that is at the beginning of the schism. It is uncertain if he ever received episcopal consecration, as no positive proof of the fact can be found.[1] Scory and Coverdale were consecrated, as we have seen above,[2] according to the new *Ordinal* of Edward VI. As for Hodgkins, it is beyond doubt that he was consecrated Bishop according to the Catholic Pontifical during the reign of Henry VIII.

These, then, were the consecrators of Parker, and, if we can rely on the Report kept in the Archiepiscopal Register of Parker in "Lambeth Palace" we must consider it historically certain that on December 17, 1559, Parker was consecrated according to the *Ordinal* of Edward VI by Barlow, assisted by the three above-mentioned "Prelates," who, together with him, not only imposed their hands on Parker, but also pronounced the words of the Anglican

1 Mgr Gaspari, in his work, *De la valeur des Ordinations Anglicanes* (Paris, 1895, p. 22), contends that the consecration of Barlow is historically certain, and assures us that, having read the Apologetic Dissertation *de Hierarchia Anglicana*, published by the Ritualists E. Denny and T. A. Lacey, "*aucun doute n'est resté dans mon éspirit.*" We must confess that after reading this dissertation, and likewise the treatises on the same subject by *Estcourt*, (*The question of Anglican Orders Discussed*, London, 1873) and by *P. Sydney Smith* (*Reasons for Rejecting Anglican Orders*, London, 1895), and recently by the *Month* and the *Tablet*, of London, in answer to the aforesaid "Dissertation," we have been rather confirmed in our doubt. However, it matters little or nothing to our present purpose whether the one or the other opinion is held. The final condemnation of the Anglican Orders rests in no way on this controversy.

2 Paragraph VI.

formula: *Receive the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.*[1]

Having been thus consecrated, "Archbishop" Parker in turn consecrated the other candidates nominated by Elizabeth, and these consecrated their successors, and so on, all conforming themselves to the new *Ordinal*, which from that time to the present was, with but a single modification, constantly and faithfully followed in all the Ordinations performed in the Anglican Church.

The modification just referred to consists in the subsequent addition to the form of Edward VI some words which made clear what power was intended to be conferred. For example, in the form used in the consecration of a Bishop, the words *Receive the Holy Ghost* were supplemented by: "For the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God."[2] But this change, having been introduced *one hundred and three years* after the consecration of Parker, when, owing to the invalidity of the Edwardian form, there existed no validly consecrated bishop, could not then, nor can it now, materially affect the subject under discussion, unless as an indication that the Anglicans themselves were at that time convinced of the defect in the Edwardian form which had been used in their Church for more than a century. In other words, to speak with the Sovereign Pontiff in his Bull: "Even if this addition could give to the form its due signification, it was introduced too late, as a century has already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal; for, the Hierarchy having become extinct, there remained no power of ordaining.[1]

1 *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum ac memento ut exsuscites gratiam Dei quae in te est per manuum impositionem. Non enim dedit nobis Deus spiritum timoris, sed virtutis et caritatis et sobrietatis.*

2 *In officium et opus episcopi in Ecclesia Dei.*

1 "Eadem adjectio, si forte quidem legitimam significationem apponere formae posset, serius est inducta, elapso iam saeculo post receptum Ordinale eduardianum; quum propterea, Hierarchia extincta, potestas ordinandi iam nulla esset."

IX.

Before finishing this brief historical sketch, useful indeed, if not essential to the full understanding and defence of the pontifical document, it will not be beside the question to touch another point to which allusion is made, and which has reference to the aforesaid consecration of Parker.

According to the ancient tradition, at the beginning of Elisabeth's reign her candidates for the Episcopacy had a meeting in an inn at London, which had for a sign the head of a horse (Nag's Head Tavern). Here the ordination was performed, it is said, in the following manner: Bishop Scory, placing the open Bible on the head of Parker and of each of the other candidates who were kneeling, pronounced the form: *Receive the authority to preach sincerely the word of God.* Then taking Parker by the hand, he said: *Arise, Bishop of Canterbury!* It is admitted on all hands that this account was actually believed by English Catholics of that time; and the mystery with which the Anglicans of those days surrounded the history of the consecration of their first "Prelates" serves to explain the origin of this legend and the fact that it was believed to be true. We may here mention that the *Register* of the consecration of Parker, which we mentioned above, and which is considered apocryphal by Cardinal Pitra,[1] seems not to have been known by the Anglicans themselves, who only found and published it fifty years after the supposed ordination.

However, we are quite willing to admit that the legend was a mere invention, and it is only to be regretted that a

1 In the life of Cardinal Pitra, written in French by *R. P. Dom Fernand Gabrol*, (Paris, 1893, p. 155), treating of the researches made by the erudite Benedictine in the Archives of England, and especially in that of "Lambeth Palace," it is asserted that "Dom Pitra put mettre la main sur l'acte de consécration de Matthew Parker et avoir le dernier mot de cette controverse. . . Cet argument qui tranchait, á son avis, definitivement la question, il se crut obligé par la discrétion de le reserver; il en confia dans une *note* manuscrite le secret aux Archives de l'Abbaye de Solesmes." The *manuscript note* embodies the following: *Cet acte porte toutes les traces d'un document apocryphe* (*Archives des missions scientifiques*, t. IV, p. 159.)

certain modern Catholic writer, not an Englishman and unfamiliar with English affairs, has mentioned it in his writings[1] as though it could serve as an argument to call in doubt the Anglican Ordinations. It is, however, a great mistake to quote the opinion of one or two writers as a proof that the whole "Roman teaching" is at fault in opposing the validity of these Ordinations, as if there was no other reasons.

What the genuine "Roman teaching" has been from the very beginning of this controversy we shall have occasion to explain in the course of this article. Suffice it for the present to say that, on the evidence of trustworthy documents, which we have the good fortune to have before us, the *legend of the tavern* was known and discredited at Rome from 1684–1685, when for the first time the question of Anglican Ordinations was subjected to the authoritative judgment of the S. Congregation of the Holy Office.[2]

We shall likewise see how the apodictic reason of the defect of form and of intention (*defectus formae et intentionis*), on which the Sovereign Pontiff, after a fresh and searching examination of the whole question, founds his final decision regarding the invalidity of those Ordinations, has been the *sole* reason which has always determined the decisions in this

1 See *Perrone, De Ordine*, n. 137, not. 4; *Gasparri, De sacra ordinatione* num. IIII. The latter, in his French work cited before, retracts his former teaching, declaring that: "cette légende, dépourvue de toute probabilité, est et doit être absolument abandonnée." With regard to P. Perrone, justice demands us to observe that, although he cited the legend in an *historical note ad eruditionem*, he nevertheless adds that it is rejected by the Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard. In the *text*, in which he treats of this item *doctrinally*, he writes: Quod si invalidae censentur Ordinationes anglicanae, non ideo est, quia ab Episcopis haereticis et Schismaticis conferuntur; sed tum ob defectum successionis episcoporum, tum *ob vitiatam essentailiter formam.*

2 In the *authentic* Acts of that time it is expressly stated that the unanimous opinion of the theologians who were consulted was pronounced against the validity of those Orders without taking into account the doubt concerning the fact of Parker's Ordination, founded upon historical evidence "*sat confusa et implexa.*" The same will appear even more evident from the acts of 1704, concerning the case of Jonn C. Gordon, of which we shall speak in a subsequent paper.

matter of the Roman Pontiffs his predecessors, and of the aforementioned Sacred Congregation. From this it will be manifest with how much truth the Cardinals, judges in the "Suprema" in a special meeting held *coram Sanctissimo* on Thursday, July 16, 1896, could assert, as the Holy Father states in his Bull: That the question laid before them had been judicially examined with full knowledge of the Apostolic See, and that *this renewed discussion and examination of the issue* had only served to bring out more clearly the *wisdom and accuracy* with which that decision had been made.[1]

X.

The apodictic reason on which Leo XIII founds his definitive decision against the validity of the Anglican Ordinations is that of the *defect of form and of intention.*[2] This twofold defect has vitiated the ordinations since 1550, in which year the *Ordinal* of Edward VI was substituted for the Catholic Pontifical, down to the present time, when the same *Ordinal*, with the modification referred to above,[3] still continues to be the rite according to which the orders are conferred.

From the Bull we learn that the Holy Father came to this conclusion, not only after having ascertained what was the opinion of his predecessors and the practice followed by the Holy See with regard to these ordinations, but much more after a mature and thorough study of the *Ordinal* itself, considered in its historical connection, which illustrates its true significance and determines the real and sole purpose which led to its adoption and substitution for the ancient rites. This new examination was made, as it should be, with every possible diligence, not neglecting any of the many means which modern criticism so places at the com-

1 "Propositam causam iampridem ab Apostolica Sede plene fuisse et cognitam et iudicatam; *ejus denuo instituta, actaque quaestione*, emersisse illustrius, *quanto* illa *iustitiae sapientiaeque pondere* totam rem absolvisset."

2 *Defectus formae et intentionis.* 3 Paragraph VIII.

mand of students. The Pontiff says: *It has, therefore, pleased us to graciously permit the cause to be re-examined, so that, through the extreme care taken in the new examination, all doubt, or even shadow of doubt, should be removed for the future.*[1]

We wish to emphasize this fact before giving detailed proof of it, in order to call attention to the wanton spirit of those Ritualists who, endeavoring by all possible means to throw discredit on the pontifical document, do not hesitate to assert that Leo XIII pronounced his final judgment against their Orders not because he has studied the intrinsic merits of the question, but solely because he is unwilling to appear, by approving the Anglican Orders, to contradict his predecessors. This statement was made publicly by Lord Halifax in his discourse at Shrewsbury, although he had before him the text of the Bull which gave the lie to the assertion.

In the Bull the Holy Father not only affirms openly the contrary: *Wherefore we ordered that the Anglican Ordinal, which is the essential point of the whole matter, should be once more most carefully examined;*[2] but he proves it, furthermore, by the fact that he devotes six pages of the Bull to demonstrate the invalidity of those Orders precisely on the ground that the *Ordinal*, according to which they were and are conferred, was and is essentially defective.

XI.

In this study of the subject we shall follow the order of the Holy Father and before all examine what was the judgment of the Holy See concerning the first Ordinations which were performed according to the new rite during the last three years of the reign of Edward VI, that is, from the first

1 *Placuit igitur de retractanda causa benignissime indulgere: ita sane ut per summam novae disquisitionis sollertiam, omnis in posternm vel species quidem dubitandi esset remota.*

2 *Iussimus in Ordinale Anglicanum, quod caput est totius causae, rursus quam studiosissime inquiri.*

appearance of the new *Ordinal* in 1550, to the death of that monarch in 1553, when, as we have said in paragraph vii, Queen Mary, his successor, abrogated the new Anglican Liturgy and put again in full force for all the sacred Ordinations the ancient Catholic Pontifical. This judgment of the Holy See is clearly expressed in the above-mentioned four Apostolic Letters of the Roman Pontiffs, Julius III and Paul IV.

Julius III, who was desirous of leading back England to the bosom of the Catholic Church with the assistance of the pious Queen, sent to her Cardinal Pole, to whom, as his Legate, he granted unusual and extraordinary faculties.[1] Among these faculties was precisely that of *rehabilitating* or of simply *qualifying* for the exercise of the sacred ministry the ecclesiastics who had exercised it from the time of the schism and of the heresy under Henry VIII and Edward VI. The *rehabilitation* could be exercised in favor of those only *who, before their fall into heresy, had been rightly and lawfully promoted or ordained.*[2] The simple *qualifying* had reference to those who had not been *rightly and lawfully promoted to Sacred Orders*,[3] that is to say, as the same Pontiff explains it in his Brief of March 8, 1554,[4] who had been ordained *not according to the accustomed form of the Church.*[5] These, *if they were found to be worthy and fitting subjects*,[6] might be *promoted to all and even the Sacred Orders and the Priesthood by their Ordinaries*[7] to minister in the Sanctuary.

1 *Bulla diei 5 ae. Augusti 1553, quae vocatur institutoria Card. Poli Legati, Arch. Secret. Vatic.* Cf. *Documenta ad Legationem Poli spectantia*, Roma, 1895, pp. 3–7.

2 *Qui ante eorum lapsum in haeresim huiusmodi, rite et legitime promoti vel ordinati fuissent.*

3 *Rite et legitime promoti ad sacros Ordines.*

4 *Breve de facultatibus legatinis* Ibidem, pp. 7–9.

5 *Non servata forma Ecclessiae consueta.*

6 *Si digni et idonei reperti fuissent.*

7 *Ad omnes etiam sacros et presbyteratus ordines ab eorum Ordinariis promoveri.*

Now, who were these that were, indeed, ordained, but *not according to the accustomed form* of the Church? When we reflect that from 1550 to 1553, as Leo XIII wisely observes in his Bull and as we have endeavored to show in paragraph vi, there existed in England no other form of Ordination than the *new* form of Edward VI, substituted by him for the *accustomed* form of the Church, it is evident that they could have been no others than those ordained according to his *Ordinal.*

If, therefore, these persons, by the express command of Julius III, were to be considered simply *laymen* and could not be placed in the sacred ministry unless they were again *simpliciter et absolute* ordained according to the Catholic form, we must conclude that the Ordinations conferred upon them according to the Anglican *Ordinal* were held to be in 1553–1554 by that Pontiff what they are considered to be in 1896 by Leo XIII, that is, *absolutely null and utterly void.*

XII.

The judgment concerning the invalidity of the Anglican Ordinations of Paul IV, who succeeded Marcellus II in 1555, was the same as that of Julius III. Before presenting the words of Paul IV, Leo XIII very opportunely mentioned in his Bull the celebrated Legation sent to Rome, February, 1555, by Queen Mary and her Consort King Philip.

The seasonableness of recording this Legation will become apparent to any one when the intimate relation of cause and effect, of request and answer, which exists between it and the Apostolic Letters of Paul IV, June 20, 1555, are recognized. From the documents which have reference to this Legation and which are kept in the Archives of the Vatican[1] we learn that its scope was to obtain from the Roman Pontiff the complete reconciliation of the Kingdom with the Holy See, to inform the Pope of the religious condition of the country,

1 *Della Riduttione del Regno d'Inghilterra, Sommario primo* (Arch. Vat. Arm. 64, Tom. 28, fol. 144); *Summarium eorum quae confirmari petuntur a Sede Apostolica pro Anglis.* (Ibid. fol. 199.)

and to request from him a solemn and full ratification of the work done up to that time by his Legate, Cardinal Pole.

From these documents we learn the following important fact: The Legation was composed of Bishop Thirlby and two gentlemen, Anthony Montague and Edward Carney. Of the first mentioned, Paul IV[1] says that *a Bishop endowed with true eloquence and sound knowledge spoke* in his presence.[2] They explained both in audience and by writing the concessions which they desired to obtain for effecting the full reconciliation of the Church of England with that of Rome, asking in particular that the Sovereign Pontiff would confirm the "Dispensations granted to *ecclesiastics*, seculars and those belonging to the various orders, that *they be promoted, both to the Orders* and to the benefices *which they had obtained invalidly during the schism.*"[3]

Since we cannot suppose that this petition was without foundation, futile in fact, or that the words were intended to be utterly devoid of sense, we must assume that, in the opinion of the Legates, there were in England at that time some ecclesiastics who had been ordained invalidly during the schism. That these could be no other than those who had been ordained according to the new rite of Edward VI is plain, not only from the fact that the Legate was concerned about these ecclesiastics and these particular dispensations only, as we shall have occasion to show later on, but it is further evident from the circumstance that the Legates, as if to prove the necessity and reasonableness of their demand, actually presented to the Holy See for examination the text of the *Ordinal* which had been used to obtain ecclesiastics during the schism.

1 *Epistola Pauli IV, Philippo et Mariae Angliae Regibus*, June 30, 1555. Cf. *Thierney, Dodd's History of the Church*, II. p. cxx; *Documenta ad Leg. Poli spectantia*, pp. 24–26.

2 *Oravit Episcopus vera eloquentia et sana praeditus doctrina.*

3 "Dispensationes cum *ecclesiasticis* personis, saecularibus et diversorum ordinum, *ut promoveantur tam in Ordinibus*, quam beneficiis *obtentis nulliter sub schismate.*" Summarium quoted above, No. 3.

Every doubt, if there could still be a reasonable doubt on this question, must vanish after reading the following decree of Queen Mary, whose representatives and faithful interpreters the Legates were at Rome. The said decree reads: "Concerning those who have been promoted to Order *according to the manner of ordaining lately introduced;* considering that *they were not truly and really ordained*, the Diocesan Bishop, if he finds them suitable and fit subjects, can supply what was before wanting."[1]

XIII.

To weaken the force of the declarations of Paul IV in answer to the English Ambassadors, it has been lately asserted by one of the champions of Anglican Orders that the Pope, having assumed the Pontificate only a short time before, could not have examined the question accurately, and hence, in his Bull of June 20, 1555,[2] either did not decide it, or decided it without mature deliberation[3]

It were needless waste of argument to dwell here on this purely gratuitous assumption. The assurance of the Pontiff is quite sufficient to convince a candid mind that he did not give his sanction of the request made by the representatives of Mary and Philip before he had accurately and searchingly

1 "Circa illos qui iam promoti fuere ad aliquos ordines *secundum modum ordinandi noviter fabricatum*, considerando quod *vere et de facto ordinati non fuerunt*, Episcopus Dioecesanus, si illos idoneos et capaces invenerit, supplere potest id quod antea in illis hominibus defuit." *Documenta ad Legat. Poli spectantia*, page 4.

2 *Bulla Secreta Pauli IV.* "Praeclara charissimi." Archiv. Vatic. *Regesta Pontificum*, n. 1850, Tom. 46, f. 55. England having been without Catholic bishops for fully sixty-six years, it must appear somewhat strange that this Bull also, referring to the important fact, should have been lost. It was, however, fortunately and providentially brought to light in good time. Our readers may remember that, scarcely had it been found after long and diligent research among the Bulls and Acts belonging to the period of the Council of Trent, the *Civiltà Catolica* was the first to announce its discovery and to publish the most important part of it in its issue 1079 of June 1, 1895. pp. 562–563.

3 The full text of this Bull was obtained from the Archives through the courtesy of the editor of the *Civiltà* and first published in the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.—*Edit.*

examined it. He writes in that Bull: "All the aforesaid *having been proposed and carefully discussed* with some of our brethren, the Cardinals of the Roman Church, *after mature deliberation* by Apostolic authority *from certain knowledge* we approve and confirm each, that is, dispensations, decrees, etc."[1]

Now, among the "dispensations" is found precisely that one which has reference to ecclesiastics *that they may be promoted to benefices and orders which were obtained invalidly during the schism.* Paul IV approves and confirms it, adding this clause: "In such a manner, however, that if any were promoted to ecclesiastical orders, whether sacred or otherwise, by any Bishop or Archbishop *who had not been lawfully and validly ordained, they be obliged to receive these orders again from their Ordinary*, and that in the meantime they do not exercise the functions of these orders."[2]

Paul IV, therefore, acknowledged that there were in England some who *in fact* received *invalidy* during the schism, not only ecclesiastical benefices, but also orders. In this connection Leo XIII justly observes in his Bull that "Neither should the passage, much to the point, in the same Pontifical Letter (of Paul IV) be overlooked, where, together with others needing dispensation, are inumerated those *who had obtained both orders and benefices*, '*nulliter et de facto.*'"[3]

1 "Praemissis omnibus cum nonnullis ex fratribus Nostris ipsius Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalibus, *propositis et diligenter* discussis, *habitaque desuper deliberatione matura*, singula (idest) dispensationes, decreta, etc. . . . auctoritate apostolica *ex certa scientia* approbamus et confirmamus."

2 "Ita tamen ut si qui ad ordines ecclesiasticos tam sacros quam non sacros ab alio quam episcopo aut archiepiscopo *rite et recte ordinato* promoti fuerunt, *eosdem ordines ab eorum ordinario de novo suscipere teneantur*, nec interim in iisdem ordinibus ministrent."

3 "Neque praetermittendus est locus ex eisdem Pontificis (Pauli IV) litteris, omnino rei congruens; ubi cum aliis beneficio dispensationis egentibus numerantur qui *tam ordines quam beneficia ecclesiastica nulliter et de facto obtinuerant.*" In reference to these words a Protestant writer in the *Glasgow Herald* (Sept. 28, 1896), accuses the Holy Father of having adulterated the text of Paul IV! When passion blinds the mind, errors of this kind do not surprise us. A masterly article on this subject is found in the *Tablet*, Oct. 17, 1896, p. 606.

Nor is this all. By the same apostolic authority Paul IV confirms and approves everything that Cardinal Pole, his Legate, had decided with regard to the Ordinations.[1] But Cardinal Pole had decided[2] that those who *received Orders wrongly*[3] could not exercise the sacred Ministry without having been again promoted to the same Orders, and that, therefore, those who had been ordained according to the new rite of Edward VI, *the form and intention of the Church not having been observed*, must retire as if *invalidly ordained.* Therefore, Paul IV, by his apostolic authority confirmed, approved and again decreed that *the Ordinations carried on according to the new Anglican rite must be considered invalid and null.*

XIV.

The Bull of Paul IV was carried to England by Bishop Thirlby, and was published by Cardinal Pole, September 22, 1555. The doubt then arose concerning the schismatical Bishops, whether or not they should be considered *lawfully and validly ordained.* The same Pope answered this doubt by a *Brief* on October 30th,[4] of the same year, saying: We, wishing to remove the doubt, and to opportunely provide for the peace of conscience of those who during the schism were promoted to Orders, by expressing more clearly the mind and intention which we had in the aforesaid letters, *declare that those Bishops and Archbishops who were not ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church cannot be said to be validly and lawfully ordained.*[5] Now we ask again who were

1 "Eadem apostolica auctoritate . . . ea omnia quae praedictus Reginaldus Cardinalis Legatus decrevit, *decernimus*, necnon omnibus his quibus ipse robur Apostolicae firmitatis adiecit Nos quoque robur ipsum adiicimus."

2 See his Letter to the Bishop of Norwich; paragraph XVII.

3 *Male ordines susceperunt.*

4 Archiv. secrec. Vatican., *Breve Original. Pauli IV*, Tom. I, n. 301.

5 Nos haesitationem hujusmodi tollere et serenitati conscientiae eorum qui, schismate durante, ad ordines promoti fuerant, mentem et intentionem quam in eisdem litteris Nostris habuimus, clarius exprimendo, opportune consulere volentes, *declaramus eos tantum episcopos et archiepiscopos qui non in forma eeclesiae ordinati et consecrati fuerunt, rite et recte ordinatos dici non posse.*

or could these Bishops be who were ordained, but not *lawfully and validly*, because they were not ordained *in the form of the Church?* Evidently they could not be the Catholic Bishops who had been ordained according to the Catholic Pontifical, nor could they be the schismatical Bishops ordained according to the same Pontifical under Henry VIII; they can be only the schismatical Bishops ordained in the reign of Edward VI according to his new rite; for note well that at that time there were only two classes of Bishops in England, those ordained according to the Catholic *Pontifical* and those ordained according to the *Ordinal* of Edward VI.

To the latter class belonged at least the six "Bishops" then living, Poynet, Hooper, Coverdale, Scory, Taylor and Harley, who, as we have noticed before,[1] had certainly been consecrated according to the *Ordinal* during the last three years of the reign of Edward VI.

XV.

Some critics maintained that the words, *in the form of the Church*, used by Paul IV, and *in the accustomed form of the Church*, used by Julius III, should be understood not strictly of the Catholic form of the Pontifical, but of the *essential form*, which is always *the form of the Church*. These and other gratuitous conjectures were well known to the Holy Father, Leo XIII, when he was preparing the Bull. Therefore, with clearness and wonderful precision he asserts that the meaning of these words was not vague and left to the caprice of every one, but clear and determined from the scope those two Pontiffs had in writing their letters in answer to the requests and doubts sent to them from England. This scope was not theoretical and foreign to the peculiar religious questions which were being agitated there, but practical and entirely comformable to the needs for which they had to provide by their instructions and special rules given to the Legate, a person versed in theological affairs. "For, since the faculties given by these Pontiffs to the Apostolic Legate had reference to England only, and to the state of religion therein,

1 Paragraph VI.

and since the rules of action were laid down by them at the request of the said Legate, they could not have been mere directions for determining the necessary conditions for the validity of ordinations in general. They must pertain directly to providing for Holy Orders in the said kingdom as the recognized condition of the circumstances and times demanded.[1]

In the Brief of Julius III, the Ordinations *not* held *in the accustomed form the Church* were declared invalid. The question, therefore, was concerning Ordinations held according to the *new form*, which, having been introduced only three years before and used only in England in a few cases, could certainly not be called *the accustomed form of the Church.* In the particular case of the Brief of Paul IV, if his declaration did not specifically refer to the Epicopal Ordinations held in England during the schism according to the *Ordinal* of Edward, but, as these critics pretend, to an *abstract* question of which no one doubts (that is, whether the use of the *essential form* is necessary for the validity of Ordinations) he, instead of *removing the doubt* or *providing for the peace of conscience* would rather by that declaration have confirmed the doubt and increased the troubles of conscience. In a matter so delicate, in which error would be most pernicious, he would have left it to the authority of each individual to judge whether or not in the new *Ordinal* the *essential form* necessary for the valid episcopal consecration were preserved.

XVI.

Therefore, as in 1896 under Leo XIII, so, also, in 1555 under Paul IV, the doubt which was examined and solved had reference to certain determined Ordinations, especially as to the *form* with which they had been administered. That form was decided by Paul IV to be substantially

1 "Quum enim facultates Legato apostolico ab iis Pontificibus tributae, Angliam dumtaxat religionisque in ea statum respicerent; normae item agendi ab eisdem Legato quaerenti impertitae, minime quidem esse poterant ad illa generatim decernenda sine quibus sacrae ordinationes non valeant, sed debebant attinere proprie ad providendum de ordinibus sacris in eo regno prout temporum monebant rerumque conditiones expositae."

different from *the form of the Church*, and consequently all the episcopal consecrations performed according to it were pronounced by him invalid. This is evidently confirmed from the practical and grave conclusion which Paul IV deduced from it in the said Brief: "And, *therefore*, we declare the persons who were promoted by them (Bishops) to Orders, DID NOT RECEIVE Orders, but that *they should and must receive* AGAIN those Orders from their Ordinary, according to the contents and tenor of our said letters.[1]

During the preliminary studies which were made at the wish of Leo XIII in preparation for his Bull, it was suggested, and, we think, not without reason, that down to the time of Paul IV, owing to confusion in the English episcopate brought about by the schism under Henry VIII and the open heresy under Edward VI, the invalidity of Anglican Ordinations not only *on account of the defect of form*, but also *on account of the absence of the episcopal character* in the ordaining Bishops, had not been sufficiently emphasized; for this reason Paul IV thought it well to make the fact clear to all by the above-mentioned restriction or clause. But whatever may be said of that, it is certain that if the episcopal character was wanting in the ordaining Bishops, this absence, according to Paul IV, must be attributed to an inherent defect of the *new* form of the *Ordinal* of Edward VI, according to which they had been consecrated.

It may, however, be objected, that, if the case be so clear, how came it to pass that during the last two years modern writers, even Catholics, could have undertaken to defend the validity, or the doubtful invalidity of the Anglican Ordinations, or at least contend that the question was still open and undecided?[2] To this question we know of no more

1 Et *propterea* declaramus personas ab eis (Episcopis) ad ordines ipsos promotas, ORDINES NON RECEPISSE, sed eosdem ordines a suo Ordinario iuxta literarum nostrarum praedictarum continentiam et tenorem, DE NOVO *suscipere debere et ad id teneri.*

2 See the works of GASPARRI, *De la valeur des Ordinations Anglicanes*; DALBUS (Abbé Portal), *Les Ordinations Anglicanes;* BOUDINHON, *Etude theologique sur les ordinations;* DUCHESNE, in the *Bulletin Critique* July 15, 1894, and the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* (passim).

suitable and more charitable answer than that given by His Holiness Leo XIII in his Bull: "*It is to the insufficient knowledge of the documents of the Apostolic See that we must perhaps attribute the fact that any Catholic writer should have considered it still an open question.*" [1]

XVII.

The given interpretation of the documents of Julius III and of Paul IV is confirmed by the constant practice followed by the Legate in the solution of particular cases and by innumerable other facts which the history of those days records as being intimately connected with their publication in England. This, also, Leo XIII indicates, with his accustomed clearness and brevity, in his Bull: "It was *in this sense* that the Legate understood the documents and commands of the Apostolic See, and duly and conscientiously obeyed them." [2]

Among the many documents which fully justify this proposition of the Bull, we find two letters of the Cardinal Legate, the first of which is addressed to the Sovereigns of England, Mary and Philip, December 24, 1554,[3] the second to the Bishop of Norwich, January 29, 1555.[4] In the first Cardinal Pole declares that he has already dispensed and is willing to dispense, according to the faculties conferred upon him by the Holy See, those who on account of the want of jurisdiction and in virtue of the pretended supremacy of the Anglican Church *nulliter and de facto had obtained dispensations, concessions, favors and indults, Orders and ecclesias-*

1 "*Documentis Apostolicae Sedis haud satis quam oportuerat cognitis, fortasse factum est ut scriptor aliquis catholicus disputationem de ea libere habere non dubitavit.*"

2 "Apostolicae Sedis documenta et mandata *non aliter* quidem Legatus intellexit, atque ita eis rite religioseque obtemperavit."

3 *Statutes 1 and 2 of Philip and Mary*, c. 8, Gibson, *Codex*, p. 41; *Documenta ad Legat. Card. Poli spectantia*, pp. 31–34.

4 Burnet, Ed. Pocock, vol. vi, p. 361; *Documenta, &c.*, pp. 9–12.

tical benefices, or other spiritual favors.[1] This has reference, however, *only* to the nullity coming from the defect of jurisdiction, as he himself explicitly states.[2]

What the Legate would do, and what his delegates should do, when the *nullity* would arise not only from the absence of jurisdiction, but from invalid ordinations, is declared in the second letter. In it the Cardinal delegating to the Bishop of Norwich some of the faculties which he received from the Pontiff, grants him also the faculty to allow ecclesiastics to exercise the functions *of their Orders* provided that they had been obtained according to the Catholic rite.[3] But if, instead of having been ordained according to this rite, they had been ordained according to the new rite of Edward, then they were to be considered as not ordained, and as such were *to be promoted lawfully and legitimately to all even sacred orders and the Priesthood by their Ordinaries, if they were found to be worthy and suitable subjects.*[4]

Moreover, that the "Catholic rite"[5] of which the Cardinal Legate speaks in this letter of 1555 was precisely that of the ancient *Pontifical*, is evident from the formal question which was put to each of the above-mentioned ecclesiastics: *whether they had been ordained eight years before*,[6] that is, before the death of Henry VIII (1547), when the Catholic Pontifical was still in full and exclusive force.

1 *Nulliter et de facto dispensationes, concessiones, gratias, et indulta, tam Ordines quam beneficia ecclesiastica, seu alias spirituales materias obtinuerunt.* In the text of the letter cited from *Gibson*, the word *concernentia* is not found, the very word, which, as we have seen in paragraph xiii, an Anglican accused Leo XIII to have omitted in his Bull.

2 *Quoad nullitatem ex defectu jurisdictionis praefatae tantum insurgentem.*

3 Dummodo in eorum (Ordinum) collatione Ecclesiae forma et intentio sit servata.

4 *Ad omnes etiam sacros et Fresbyteratus ordines a suis Ordinariis, si digni et idonei reperti fuerint, rite et legitime promoveri.*

5 *Ecclesiae* forma et intentio.

6 *Utrum, ante octo annos fuerint ordinati.* In the MSS. of Harles, 421, are found the verbal reports of these processes with the aforementioned question.

XVIII.

"And the same was done by Queen Mary." To the pontifical documents Mary gave the same interpretation. This Leo XIII affirms, and the same is historically demonstrated by the acts of that pious Queen. It is sufficient to record her celebrated Decree, cited by us in paragraph xii, against the ecclesiastics who were ordained *according to the manner of ordaining recently introduced.*[1] It is also known that Mary, by the authority of the Legate, deposed from the Sees which they occupied all the "Bishops" (Taylor, Harley and others)[2] who had been consecrated according to the *Ordinal* of her brother Edward. We have before us the processes of these depositions, with their reasons, which confirm the sentence. In that against Taylor we read: *Deposed on account of the nullity of his consecration.*[3] In the second, against Harley, we read: *Deposed on account of wedlock and heresy and as above* (that is, *on account of the nullity of his consecration.*)[4]

Similar to that of Queen Mary was the conduct of those who, as Leo XIII in the same place assures us, with her helped to restore the Catholic religion to its former state.[5] Let the testimony of two illustrious Bishops, Gilbert Bourne, of Bath and Wells, and Bonner, the chief commissioner of Cardinal Pole for the diocese of London. The first, in his letter of April 8, 1554, to his Vicar General, John Cottrell, enjoins on him to begin proceedings against the pretended marriages of the secular and regular clergy "and against those married *laymen* who under the pretext and disguise of the priesthood rashly and illicitly interfered in ecclesiastical affairs and *de facto* acquired parochial churches with the care

1 Secundum modum ordinandi noviter fabricatum.

2 See Paragraph vi.

3 *Privatus ob nullitatem consecrationis. Burnet, History of the Reformation,* II, 441.

4 *Privatus propter coniugium et haeresim et ut supra* (i. e. *ob nullitatem consecrationis*). Ibid.

5 Cum ea dederunt operam ut religio et instituta catholica in pristinum locum restituerentur.

of souls and ecclesiastical dignities in opposition to the sacred canons and ecclesiastical rights."[1] That these who intruded themselves *under the guise of the priesthood* were those who had been ordained according to the new rite of Edward VI is deduced also from the wording of the sentences in about forty cases cited in MS. of Harles.[2]

Bishop Bonner is even more explicit. He writes: "These ministers, appointed during the schism, have not received *in the ordination lately introduced* the power of offering in Mass the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Jesus Christ."[3] For the rest, it is an incontestable historical fact that, during the reign of Mary, no bishop or minister ordained according to the *Ordinal* of Edward was ever admitted, by the Legate or the Papal Commissioners Gardiner and Brooks or by other Catholic Bishops, to the exercise of the Orders conferred according to that new rite; moreover, that no account was taken of those Orders, and hence, even if such bishops or ministers were condemned on account of heresy, they were never degraded, as was always the case with those who had been validly ordained.

Some critics, following perhaps Dr. Lee, have recently asserted that Bishops Thirlby, Warton, Aldrich and King were rehabilitated and recognized by the Legate as true

1 "Nec non in eos *laicos* coniugatos qui, *praetextu et sub velamine presbyteratus ordinis*, sese in iuribus ecclesiasticis temere et illicite immiscuerunt ac ecclesias parochiales cum cura animarum et dignitates ecclesiasticas contra sacras canonum sanctiones et iura ecclesiastica de facto assecuti fuerunt." MS. 6967, f. 58. Cf. *Strype*, *Eccles. Mem.* Ed. Oxon., V, 352.

2 MS. 421.

3 "Iste ministelli constituti, grassante adhuc schismate, nullam *in novitur fabricata ordinatione* auctoritatem acceperunt offerendi in Missa corpus et sanguinem Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi." In the Preface of his work, *Profitable and necessarye doctryne* (Estcourt, p. 58). Whoever desires other testimonies of English writers of that time will find them in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of Dec. 21, 1895, pp. 742–744. We cite one of *Stapleton*: "By what authority do these pretended Protestant Bishops arrogate to themselves the custody of the Fold of Christ? Who laid hands upon them? I declare on the faith of Sacred Scripture and of the practice of the primitive Church that they are no Bishops at all." (From his book *Firmness of Faith*, published at Antwerp, 1565.)

bishops, although they had been consecrated according to the Ordinal of Edward VI; but their assertion is evidently false, since it appears from authentic documents that they received episcopal consecration according to the Catholic rite of the Pontifical. In fact, the English Episcopal Registry attests that all four were consecrated before 1550, when the *Ordinal* of Edward was *not in existence:* Thirlby was consecrated in 1540; Wharton in 1536; Aldrich in 1537; King in 1536.

(*To be Continued.*)

SOME NOTES ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF ROMAN HYMNODY.

For the facts contained in the following "Notes" we are indebted chiefly to Chevalier's "*Poésie Liturgique Traditionnelle*" (*Desclée Lefebvre et Cie., Tournai*); the Abbé Pimont's *Hymnes du Breviaire Romain;* Dom Gueranger's *Institutions Liturgiques*, and Monsieur Duchesne's "*Origines du Culte Chrétien*" (*Ernest Thorin, Paris.*)

I.

Although the origin of Christian hymnody goes back to the very cradle of the Church there can be little doubt that all the earlier Christian poems were of a purely individual and private character, nor does the practice of singing hymns seem to have found its way into the public services of the Church before the third century.

It was probably first introduced at those semi-public assemblies which met daily at the houses of private persons—those assemblies for prayer and praise which were the precursors of the Divine Office.

As the hours at which these meetings took place were by no means uniform, so, too, the manner in which worship was offered was not always the same; but that hymns were in some cases sung there can be little doubt.

It is uncertain at what date these devotions were first celebrated in public churches, but in the fourth century the

circumstance that they were adopted by congregations of ascetics—already numerous and influential—gave to them a more prominent position than they had held hitherto, and in the last quarter of a century St. John Chrysostom (379–392) and other contemporary writers bear witness to the fact that, in their day, Office was publicly celebrated at the canonical hours. This is an important point. The Divine Office once installed in Church remained there. The ascetics who had been indirectly the cause of the innovation soon disappeared, or were incorporated into monasteries with private chapels, where they recited apart their daily and nightly prayers; but to the body of the faithful generally it seemed highly fitting that Office—though they did not always take part in it—should continue to be regularly celebrated for them in their cathedrals and parish churches. Thus the clergy were to accept the sacred burden, to which at first they had been strangers, and thus the obligation of the canonical hours, like the perpetual celibacy of her priesthood, is a legacy for which the Western Church is indebted to monasticism. Indeed, as the Abbé Duchesne points out, so great was the popularity of the perfect—the continent—the men of God, as they were called, that the clergy, without losing prestige, without even risking their right to govern the Christian community being called in question, could hardly have done otherwise than follow in these two cardinal points the programme of the monks.

As was the case with the organization of the private services from which it was evolved, the order of the Divine Office, in these early days, was not everywhere the same. True the metropolitan church generally imposed its usages on its suffragans, but, apart from this, until the ninth century, there seems to have been but little uniformity.

It is not surprising, then, to find that the custom of hymn singing was not everywhere adopted at the same time. In those districts where it was already in vogue before the Divine Office was recited in public, doubtless it continued still to flourish, but elsewhere its introduction seems to have been gradual.

The Council of Laodicea—held after 360, but before 381—in its fifty-ninth canon, decrees that *no particular psalms*, that is hymns composed by private individuals, and unapproved, should be recited in church: ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; St. Basil (379) in his letter, *Ad Neocaesarienses clericos*, *lxiii*, defends the singing of hymns, and points out that the practice was usual throughout the East; St. Gregory Nazianzen (390) in his *Carmen iambicum*, *xv*, *145*, *146*, clearly distinguishes between hymnody and psalmody; so, too, St. Gregory of Nyssa (396) in his *Oratio de festo Paschae* thus speaks of them: "*Sermo autem*," he says, "*per totam noctem circumsonans in psalmis, hymnis, cantionibusque spiritualibus tanquam flumen quoddam gaudii per aures omnium influens nos optime replevit.*"

If we turn to the West, we find St. Hilary, on his return to Poitiers (360, 368), after his exile in the East, composing for the use of his church that book of hymns of which St. Jerome speaks, and St. Isidor of Seville, and the Council of Toledo; and a few years later (386) at Milan, St. Ambrose writing for the consolation of his flock, during the persecution of the Empress Justina, his incomparable hymns; then comes Pope Damasus (384), and Elpis, and, greatest of all, Prudentius, who undoubtedly wrote his *Cathemerinon* for the Divine Office.

The custom of hymn singing, then, goes back to the first ages of the Church. Introduced in many places at those semi-private reunions, to which we have already alluded, it soon made its way, together with them, into the sanctuary itself, and, at an early date, became everywhere an integral part of the Divine Office.

II.

But at what period were hymns first embodied in the breviary of the Church of Rome?

The greater number of liturgical writers—among them Mabillon, Tomasi, Grancolas and Galliciolo—assign a comparatively recent date to this event, viz., during the eleventh,

the twelfth, or even the thirteenth century; but on the other hand, Arevalus maintains that the custom of singing hymns *inter divina officia* was first adopted in the Eternal City, either at the Ambrosian epoch, or, at latest, when the order of St. Benedict first began to influence the customs of the Western Church, that is to say, towards the opening of the sixth century.

The Abbé Pimont goes into the whole question at some length, and following Arevalus quotes in favor of an earlier date, the testimony of St. Celestine I, culled from a fragment of the discourse which that Pontiff pronounced at the Synod held at Rome in the year 450 for the condemnation of Nestorius—"I remember," he said, "that Ambrose of blessed memory, on the birthday of our Lord Jesus Christ made all his people sing with one accord—

Veni, Redemptor gentium,
Ostende partum Virginis,
Miretur omne saeculum,
Talis decet partus Deum.

Now Faustus, Bishop of Reji, who died towards the close of the fifth century—probably in 480 or 493—in his letter to the deacon Grecus, speaking of this very hymn, affirms that it was sung in his day on the Feast of the Nativity in all the churches of Italy and Gaul.

But this is not all. Paulinus, the biographer of St. Ambrose, who wrote at the beginning of the fifth, perhaps before the close of the fourth century, asserts that at that time hymns were sung not only at Milan, but in almost all the provinces of the West—"*per omnes pene occidentis provincias*," and less than two centuries later St. Isidor of Seville was able to affirm that they were then sung in *all* the churches of the West.

"Now," continues M. Pimont, "it is not easy to believe that situated in the very centre of this liturgical movement, the mother and mistress of all the churches remained a stranger to it, especially when her pontiffs took delight in paying such striking homage to the Ambrosian hymns, and, follow-

ing the example of the great Bishop of Milan, themselves, in their turn, became hymn-writers."

It has been urged in opposition to this view, that Amalarius of Metz, who died in 836 or 838, in his treatise *De ecclesiasticis officiis* makes no mention of hymn-singing at Rome, though he frequently speaks of the liturgical customs of that city. But was he not writing of the basilica of St. Peter's only, with whose canons he seems to have been on familiar terms? It would seem so, especially when we take into consideration the testimony of Walafrid Strabo who, writing at the beginning of the ninth century, in his treaties *De ecclesiasticarum rerum exordiis et incrementis* speaks of the use of hymns as a Roman tradition which was at length adopted by almost all the churches of Western Christendom. Now how could he write in this way—he died in 840—if only eighteen years before, perhaps only ten years before, Amalarius could find at Rome itself no trace of hymn-singing?

Space forbids us to follow further the thread of the learned Abbé's arguments. Suffice it to say that he arrives at the following conclusions:

(*i*) That, notwithstanding the silence of Amalarius, it has not been clearly shown that the practice of singing hymns during the Divine Office was not already in vigor in the principal churches of Rome at the Benedictine epoch, that is to say, at the beginning of the sixth century.

(*ii*) That it is more than probable that they were sung in the ninth century.

(*iii*) That there is no doubt whatever in this regard for the latter years of the tenth century.

The latest writer on the subject, Canon Chevalier, comes to a like conclusion. Taking the same view of the silence of Amalarius as M. Pimont takes, he says that, whether as early as the days of Charlemagne hymns were included in the Roman breviary will remain a doubtful question until some eighth century Roman office-book is discovered, not proper to any particular Roman church, but common to the Roman province; nevertheless he himself inclines to the

opinion that Rome adopted her hymns at the time when she assimilated the modifications introduced by Alcuin and others into the Franco-Roman breviary, that is to say, in the tenth century, or possibly in the ninth century under Charles the Bald.

Similarly Guéranger, who says that the Church of Rome could not have adopted her hymns later than the eleventh century, and Duchesne—"at Rome, until the ninth century at least, hymns were unknown."

III.

The question next arises—What hymns were sung at Office during the early ages at Rome?

There can be no doubt that they were identical with the sequence of hymns chanted by the monks of St. Benedict, and these, so far as concerned the *Commune de tempore*, are indicated for us in two MSS.—No. 2106 of Darmstadt, and No. 1418 of Trèves—which Mons, who was the first to call attention to them, and with him Pimont, attributes to the eighth century, but which Canon Chevalier considers to be possibly the product of a century later. In either case their origin is of a sufficiently early date.

The first of these gives the hymns for the Little Hours—the same as those we sing now, except that there is an alternative hymn, *Christe qui lux es et dies*, for Compline, and two vesperal hymns, *Lucis Creator optime*, and *O Lux Beata Trinitas*—the old form of *Iam sol recedit igneus*.

The Trèves MS. specifies no hymn for Compline, otherwise it furnishes a complete list of all the hymns for the *Commune de tempore*. This only differs from our own in the omission of special hymns for Sunday Matins and Lauds in summer time, and in the substitution of another Vesper hymn for Saturdays—*Deus creator omnium*, an Ambrosian which does not appear at all in the modern Roman breviary. It may be interesting to point out that a Sarum rubric directs that it should be sung *in sabbatis a* "*Domine ne in ira*"—the second Sunday, that is, after the Epiphany—*usque ad Quadragesimam quando de Dominica agitur*.

Apropos of this same hymn, Raoul de Tongres (1403) observes in his treatise *De Canonum observantia*—"*Hunc hymnum Fratres minores, et alios plures male omittunt quia authentica est et multum pulcher.*" Is its omission, then, from the modern Roman breviary a relic of Franciscan influence? It would seem so, for Raoul, and he is almost the only liturgical writer who sheds any light on this obscure period, distinctly affirms that Pope Nicholas III, probably about 1209, made the use of the Franciscan breviary obligatory on all the churches of Rome.

But to continue. It is worthy of note that St. Ethelwold, who died in 963, assigns for his newly established English Benedictines precisely the same hymns as those contained in the Trèves MS., save only that he omits from his catalogue the *Lucis Creator optime.*

The same Raoul of Tongres gives a list of hymns which, he says, were to be found in his day, together with many others, in the ancient hymnaries of Rome: "*Omnes autem praedicti hymni et adhuc plures alii reperiuntur Romae in hymnariis antiquis,*" *etc.*

For the *Commune de tempore*, except that there are special hymns for Sunday Matins and Lauds in summer time—those still in use—we find the same hymns as in the Trèves list.

Raoul's catalogue for the *Proprium de tempore* comprises no less than thirty-seven special hymns and of these we still sing twenty-two.

The remaining fifteen are thus made up. There are two extra hymns for Christmas—in place of Prudentius's Epiphany hymn, *O sola magnarum*, which did not find its way into Roman choir-books before 1550, a choice is offered of two others, two extra Lenten hymns are given, and two different Ascension hymns take the place of those we now sing. The rest are proper Compline hymns, viz., one each for Advent, Christmas, Lent, Passiontide, Easter, Ascension, and Trinity.

The hymns for the *Commune Sanctorum* are nineteen in number, only three of them have fallen into disuse; those for the *proprium*, sixteen, and six of them still remain to us. That is to say, more than two-thirds of the entire list of

hymns are still retained in the breviary of the Church of Rome. Our modern breviary certainly contains several ancient hymns which do not appear in this list, but it should be born in mind that Raoul does not profess to give a complete list; what he says is: "All these hymns and *many others beside* are to be found in the ancient hymnaries of Rome."

IV.

Before going further it will be convenient to take a glance at the language, the style, the æsthetique, of these outpourings of the Saints and Fathers of the Church.

To compare them to the poems of Horace, or of Virgil, or of Tibullus—to blame them for their lapses from the just principles of Latin versification as conceived in classic times—because their vocabulary differs so widely from the vocabulary of Augustus—would be as unjust as to find fault with the literary masterpieces of the old civilization, because they do not always contain the lofty sentiments of Christian authors.

The age of Augustus had hardly closed when it was already far away, and the Latin tongue—then at the service of so many different peoples, which each brought to it something of their own speech, was rapidly descending the path of that irremediable degeneracy whose fatal term is death.

It was on this headlong course to ruin that it was arrested by the Church, not to bring it back to the old form which it had before, but to make it her own,—to purify, to spiritualize, to transform it by contact with the Word of God, to fit it to be the vehicle of the Divine Message which it was her mission to proclaim.

Three distinct inspirations divided between them the intellectual life of antiquity: the genius of the East, poetic, contemplative, symbolical; the genius of Greece, subtle, speculative, philosophical; and the genius of Rome—the genius of law, of empire, of action.

That the old civilization should become in its entirety the heritage of the new, that nothing should be lost of the intel-

lectual inheritance of the human race, it was necessary that this trinity of spirits should be preserved, that it should become, as it were, the very soul of the budding nations of Europe, by permeating and leavening that form of speech which was destined to be the official currency of their common worship.

In this leavening of the old Latin tongue the translation of the Holy Scriptures had no little share. It stood, perhaps, as the chief factor in its transformation, for at a very early date, even before St. Jerome's Vulgate, the old Itala, daily read at church, daily taken part in by the common chanting of its canticles and psalms, had made the ears of Latin Christendom familiar with the glories of the Hebrew style.

Thus the spirit of the East breathed into the Latin tongue, enriching it not only with a new vocabulary, but giving to it that vivid imagery, that bold construction, those unexpected associations of ideas and words which confront us, for example, again and again, in the strophes of Catholic hymnody. But this was not all. By the same means the genius of Greece made its influence felt, and at the same time.

Three qualities had hitherto been lacking to the sonorous speech of Rome, or she preserved them only in a very limited degree—delicacy, flexibility, boldness. She was but ill at ease when it was a question of expressing the sentiments of the heart, she bent herself but poorly to the creation of new words, her primitives engendered their derivatives far too sparsely for the adequate designation of the varied shades of Christian dogma, and her preference of the concrete to the abstract, offering another obstacle to the generation of words, hampered her still further in the due expression of definite thought.

The inflowing, however, of the Greek spirit, through the agency of the New Testament, was destined to change all this, and to give to the old language of Rome a power of expansion which she had never known before.

Here we have the sources whence flowed that marvellous terminology which the Church employs for the manifestation

of her evangelical teaching, the very name of which—*evangelium*—is of such rare beauty.

To initiate the world in the sublime mysteries of her theology she made use first of all of such words as *spiritualis*, *carnalis*, *sensualis*, *praedestinare*, *salvare* (*salvator*), *regenerare*, *justificare*, *sanctificare* (*sanctificator*), *vivicare*, *mortificare*. Then, passing from the concrete to the abstract, she said—*sensualitas*, *praedestinatio*, *salvatio*, *regeneratio*, *justificatio*, *sanctificatio*, *vivificatio*, *mortificatio*, *concupiscentia*, *corruptibilitas*, *incorruptibilitas*.

Then, amongst others, her heart dictated such expressions as *longanimitas*, *dilectio*, *compassio*, *eleemosyna*, *charismata*, and above all, that untranslatable word, the divine charm of which has no equivalent in any other tongue—*eucharistia*.

In fine, she learnt the precious art of forming composite words—words in which she condensed the very essence of Christian mysticism. Such, for example, as *convivere*, *commori*, *consepeliri*, *convivificare*, *conglorificare*, *conregnare*, *convescere*, *congaudere*, *collaetari*, and many others, which the reader will readily call to mind.

Moreover she invested a host of commonplace words with a new and mystic meaning. *Iustitia*, for example, and *confiteri* (*confessio*), and *credere* (*credulus*) and *gratia*, and *gloria*, and above all, *fides*, *spes* and *charitas*, and that word, so base in the eyes of the old civilization, but from the Christian standpoint so sublime—*humilitas*.

The Neo-Latin of the Church's liturgy sprung, then, at least in some measure, from the impotence of the old idiom to adequately express her teaching; but there is another circumstance which, doubtless, in this regard exercised no little influence.

It is now generally admitted that, from the moment that Rome possessed a literature her speech became twofold. The language introduced by her *literati* was a thing distinct from the people's tongue, and to the people's tongue the Church, of necessity, gave her preference.

"Pagan art," says Ozanam, "was the proud pleasure of the few"—*Odi profanum vulgus et arceo;* but the Church took a

broader view of society, and wrote above her doors—*Venite omnes.*

All this is exemplified in a special manner by our old liturgical hymnody, which traces its origin not so much to the classic poesy of Rome, as to the doggerel ballads of the Roman people, and like them has for its basis not so much quantity and measure as accent, and syllableism, and rhyme.

Of this last characteristic two sorts figure in our breviary hymns, double rhyme, which affects the last two syllables taken together, and single rhyme, which influences the last syllable only.

As to the first of these, Gautier observes that it was not employed till 1030 or 1040; but Du Méril quotes a hymn to God thus rhymed which he attributes to the ninth century.

However this may be there can be no doubt that assonance, or simple rhyme, goes back to the first ages of popular Latin poetry. Even in the poems of Ennius rhyming is by no means rare. More or less suppressed on the introduction of Greek metres, it soon sprang to life again, and its resurrection coincides with the fall of the magniloquent forms of classic literature.

As early as the fourth century it was used in Christian poetry, if not earlier. The hymns of St. Ambrose and of Prudentius bear witness to it, and towards the close of the ninth century its adoption had become general.

From thence until the Renaissance the Church's hymns were almost all rhyming, and although with the advent of the new learning, double rhyming, for the most part, went out of fashion, single rhymes, as they appear in the compositions of Prudentius and St. Ambrose, have never ceased to be employed.

Destined to be sung by the people, written in the language of the people, and cast in the same mould in which their songs were cast, simplicity, vivacity and unction, especially in the case of the earlier compositions, are the qualities which most distinctly characterized our Roman breviary hymns.

Their construction is, generally, simple, their phrasing is almost always concise, and each verse is not unfrequently complete in itself. Thus St. Ambrose sings:

Gallo canente spes redit,
Ægris salus refunditur,
Mucro latronis conditur,
Lapsis fides revertitur.
(*Dom. Hymn. hiem. ad Laud.*)

Extingue flammas litium,
Aufer calorem noxium,
Confer salutem corporum,
Veramque pacem cordium.
(*Ad Sextam.*)

Their life, their vivacity of expression, is exemplified amongst a hundred others in such verses as these:

Os, lingua, mens, sensus, vigor,
Confessionem personent,
Flamescat igne charitas,
Accendat ardor proximos.
(*Ad Tertiam.*)

Nox, et tenebrae, et nubila,
Confusa mundi et turbida,
Lux intrat, albescit polus,
Christus venit, discedite.
(*Feria IV ad Laud.*)

The sweetness of the *Ave Maris Stella* occurs to one at once as affording a typical example of that heavenly sweetness which, in a greater or less degree, is characteristic of all ancient liturgical hymnody.

Christian genius, then, created a poetry of its own which, for style, had little in common with the poetry of the old civilization, and which, even in the earliest period, had marked tendencies towards a complete divorce with the

ancient metres, and finished by taking those new and varied forms which are so perfectly embodied, for example, in the songs of Adam of St. Victor.

V.

Let us now briefly view the circumstances which led up to the correction and, in many cases, to the re-casting of the breviary hymns under Pope Urban VIII, and give the reader some account of that correction and re-casting.

For more than a thousand years the new poetry had been held in the highest esteem throughout the Western Church, but with the re-birth of learning in the fourteen hundreds another spirit came over Europe. The humanist knew no beauty but the beauty of the old civilization, and in his bosom the ruggedness of the new poetry was bound to fester and rankle.

As early as 1374 Petrarch had inveighed against the barbarisms of the Fathers, but Jacopo Sannazar, who died in 1530, was perhaps the first to stimulate the reaction against our hymns by composing, in honor of SS. Gaudiosus and Nazarius, certain odes which joined beauty and elegance to a strict observance of the laws of prosody.

About this time, too, several editors of liturgical poetry thought it incumbent on them to modify the ancient text with a view to making it conform with the rules of classic versification. Jacques Wimpheling, for example, who published at Strasbourg, in 1513, his *Hymni de tempore et de Sanctis*, and Jose Clichtove who, two years later, brought out at Paris his *Elucidator Ecclesiasticus*.

The Roman Church believed that her honor and dignity would be compromised if she remained indifferent to the movement, and Leo X, doubtless recognizing the impossibility of correcting hymns which had for their authors such men as St. Gregory and St. Ambrose, determined to endow the Church with a new hymnary.

The man whom the Pope commissioned to execute this important work was that extraordinary individual, in turn Benedictine, Carthusian, notary and chancellor of the Coun-

cil of Pisa, and at last Bishop of Guardia, Zachari Ferreri of Vicenza.

But Leo, who, according to the author himself, had followed day by day with the greatest interest the progress of the work, reading over and approving each of the hymns as they were written, did not live to see it ended, nor was it till four years after his death, on the 1st of February, 1525, that the work was at last completed.

This attempt could not have been otherwise than pleasing to Jules de Medici, who, under the title of Clement VII, had, in the meantime, ascended the pontifical throne. He was the friend of Erasmus and himself a humanist, and before he put on the tiara had accepted from Francesco Priscianese the dedication of *his* corrected version of the hymns of the Roman breviary. By a brief dated December 11, 1525, he gave the new hymnary his approval, but its adoption was not made obligatory, and Merati affirms that it never came into use.

As to the literary and artistic merit of Zachari's work, Dom Gueranger thus appreciates it: "We find there," he says, "all the imagery and allusions to pagan beliefs which are to be met with in the works of Horace, but several of these hymns are simple and beautiful . . . they are at bottom the work of a strong and pure inspiration, which is distinctly recognizable beneath the mask of classic diction." And the Abbé Batiffol—the same whose condensed excellence anent Benedict XIV and his Breviary[1] we had the pleasure of laying before the readers of this REVIEW some months since—a critic not easily pleased, who finds the Epiphany hymn of Prudentius feeble and cold, and in the long category of western hymn writers but one only, Venantius Fortunatus, worthy of the name of poet ("*le seul vrai poète de l'église d'occident*")—even the brilliant, fastidious Batiffol can discover not a little to be thankful for in poor Zachari's effusions. After pointing out that although there is, of a

1 Histoire du Bréviaire Romain par Pierre Batiffol: Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1894.

truth, in these hymns too much of Phœbus and Olympus and the Styx—in proof of the aptness of which remark we would call attention, for example, to his Lenten Vesper hymn—*Bacchus abscedat*,[1]—the learned Abbé waxes enthusiastic over the very quality of their defects: "*Cette impeccable pureté de langue et cette élégance de facture que goûtaient justement ses contemporains, et cette ingéniosité assez refléchie pour être capable de nous toucher encore.*" And anent Ferrari's composition in honor of St. Gregory and of the Apostles, he adds: "*Ces deux hymnes-la valent la meilleur part des hymnes anciennes et modernes.*"

But to continue. During the pontificate of Paul III several other tentatives of the same kind were made. Among them may be cited the hymn collections of Nicolas Archius and Laurentius Frizzolius, and the corrected Roman breviary sent by Pierre Fenet to Filippo Archiniti, Bishop of Saluzzo and Vicar Apostolic of the city of Rome. Paul, however, gave to none of them official approbation, and one and all shared the fate of Zachari's labor.

Since then, during the brief period which covered the reigns of Julius III, Marcellus II, Paul IV and Pius IV—in all only sixteen years—the hymn question seems to have been allowed to rest.

Indeed the great liturgical reviser, St. Pius V, himself left it untouched, save that from the remodeled office books

1 Bacchus abscedat, Venus ingemiscat
Nec jocis ultra locus est, nec escis,
Nec maritali thalamo, nec ulli
Ebrietati.

Clauditur ventri ingluvies voraci
Clauditur linguae labium loquaci,
Iamque de verbis abigunt salaces
Seria nugas.

Desinant risus, veniant fletus;
Iam theatrales procul este ludi;
Ite comoedi procul, et tragoedi
Ite profani.

of 1568 he cut out the time-honored Trinity hymns of Stephen of Tournai.

Later on came the revision of Clement VIII, whose apostolic letters on this subject are dated May 10, 1602. Little more was effected, however, than the substitution of a few new hymns for some of the old ones. Such for example as the *Fortem virili pectore* of Cardinal Silvio Antoniano and Bellarmine's Vesper hymn in honor of St. Mary Magdalene.

It was not till twenty years later that the old hymnary was seriously menaced. It happened thus :

Early in 1623 Maffeo Barberini—"*apis attica*," as they called him, on account of his fluent Greek—had ascended the papal throne as Urban VIII.

A man of ripe scholarship, an ardent humanist, and a poet himself of no mean capacity—the modern Roman breviary owes to him no less than five hymns—he soon turned his attention to fresh corrections of the liturgical books, in which, "according to the opinion of pious and learned men, there still remained not a few things which needed reformation."

The revision of the hymnary was confided to four Jesuits—Famiano Strada, Tarquinio Galluzzi, Mathias Sabriewski and Jerome Petracci. In 1629 the work was completed and the new hymns issued from the Vatican press.

The publication was preceded by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites permitting its use, but not making it obligatory. This was, doubtless, an essay. Nor was it till two years later, by the brief, *Divinam psalmodiam*, dated January 25, 1631, that Urban approved the new revision.

In their preface to the first edition the editors tell us how they treated the time-honored hymns of the Church of Rome. Alone, they say, they have preserved intact the *Ave Maris Stella*, and St. Thomas' three hymns in honor of the Blessed Sacrament ; they have, nevertheless, respected as much as possible, the compositions of such illustrious writers as, for example, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory, Prudentius, Sedulius, etc., and for the rest, while leaving many expressions unaltered which might well have been changed, they have done what seemed good in their own eyes.

The number of false quantities which they thus corrected amounted to no less than nine hundred and fifty-two. Nine hundred and fifty-two syllables out of seventeen hundred and fourteen verses. The number of hymns upon which they operated was not very large—only eighty-one. They found, then, from their point of view, on an average almost a dozen errors in each composition.

These changes, however, were in reality by no means equally distributed. Some of the hymns were almost untouched, others were practically rewritten.

Among the first class may be cited the hymns for Prime and Tierce, of which the doxologies only were altered, and those for Sext and None, and the Sunday Vesper hymn, in all three of which, save the doxologies, but one word was changed.

Among the second, the Advent Vesper hymn, which retains but one unchanged line, and only twelve words of the original composition, the Paschal hymn for Lauds, which likewise has but twelve of the author's words and not a single line unchanged, the Vesper hymn for Michaelmas, and the hymn for Church dedication festivals, of which the very metres were altered.

What then is to be thought of Pope Urban's reform? We venture, in this regard, to offer the following observations:

It was undertaken at a time when all Europe was spellbound by the glamor of the Renascence, and the correctors themselves—members of an order occupied extensively with educational work, and consequently with the cultivation of *belles lettres*—were necessarily exposed in a very special manner to fall under the fascination of its influence. Their exemption from choir duty, too, made the danger all the greater; the old hymns were written for congregational singing and, had the learned revisers sung them more frequently, they would have been in a better position to appreciate their beauties.

Moreover the general ignorance which at that time existed concerning the influence of accent as distinguished from quantity, and of the metrical rules which governed the com-

position of mediæval verse, made them stumble at each step against pretended infractions of the laws of prosody, which, in reality, had no existence, and, only too often, under pretext of clearness and elegance, sacrifice primitive words, rich in symbolism and mystic depth, in favor of classical expressions, in comparison to them, meaningless and poor.

Nevertheless the revision was intended to be, and undoubtedly was, as much as the circumstances of the time and the prejudices of the men who undertook it would permit, carried out on conservative lines. The foundation of the hymns was not appreciably altered, nor was their antique flavor altogether washed out.

It is worthy of note that the new hymnary was not well received by the ecclesiastical world.

In Rome itself the chapters of St. John Lateran—the mother and mistress of the churches—and of St. Peter's would have, and to this day will have none of it, the older religious orders rejected it, root and branch, and it took a hundred and fifty years, at least, to make it accepted by the secular clergy of France, even in those dioceses which followed the Roman rite, pure and simple. Few Roman breviaries printed in France before 1789 contain the new hymns, even when this is the case they are invariably relegated to an appendix, and at Avignon the old hymns were sung until well into the present century—till 1834 or 1835.

Moreover, the supplement for the local Church of Rome contains to this day the old versions of the two hymns—*Rex gloriose martyrum* and *Æterna Christi munera*—they are allotted to the festival of the Roman Pontiffs—and Rhaban Maur's *Christe Sanctorum* in its old form, as well as the uncorrected text of his Lauds Hymn, *Tibi Christe Splendor Patris*—the *Te Splendor et Virtus Patris* of Urban's revision —still hold their place in the Roman Office for St. Raphael's day.

In conclusion. The opinion amongst men of letters seems to be rapidly gaining ground that the days are ripe for a fresh revision, in a conservative sense, of our ancient breviary hymns. Were such a revision critically and judiciously

carried out, there can be little doubt that it would redound alike to the enhancement of the beauty of our offices, to the furtherance of true scholarship and to an increase of solid devotion.

F. E. GILLIAT SMITH.

Bruges, Belgium.

ECCLESIASTICAL CHRONOLOGY—FOR THE YEAR 1896.

JANUARY.

4. Most Rev. John Hennessy, Archbishop of Dubuque, Iowa, and Rt. Rev. John Shanley, Bishop of Jamestown, North Dakota, received in Papal audience.

5. Investing of Cardinal Satolli with the red beretta in the Cathedral of Baltimore, Md.

6. Br. Christian appointed to succeed Br. Romuald (deceased) as Visitor in the Province of Baltimore, of the "Brothers of the Christian Schools."

7. Reception to Cardinal Satolli at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., in honor of his elevation to the Cardinalate.

—. Reception to Very Rev. William H. O'Connell by the Alumni Association of the American College, Rome, in honor of his appointment as Rector of the College.

8. Death of Cardinal Joseph Mary Granniello. Born February 8, 1834. Created Cardinal June 13, 1893.

12. Beatification of Blessed S. D. Bernadine Realini, S. J., in the Vatican Basilica.

18. Congregation of the Holy Office issues the Decree *Postquam Societates occultae* regarding the *Knights of Pythias*, *Odd Fellows* and *Sons of Temperance*.

19. Beatification of Blessed Theophilus de Corte of the Minors Observant.

20. Death of Cardinal W. René Meignan, Archbishop of Tours. Born April 11, 1817. Created Cardinal January 16, 1893.

27. Cardinal Logue received in Papal audience.

22. Death of Rt. Rev. Bp. Luck, O. S. B., of Auckland, New Zealand.

29. Bishop Arthur Riddel, of Northampton, received in Papal audience.

Installation of V. Rev. W. H. O'Connell at the American College, Rome.

FEBRUARY.

6. Reception to Cardinal Satolli by the American Catholic Historical Society, Philadelphia.

16. Opening of the Catholic Winter School in New Orleans.

23. Rt. Rev. Cuthbert Hedley, Bishop of Newport, and Rt. Rev. Maurice Graham, Coadjutor of Plymouth, received in Papal audience.

26. Appointement of an archivist for the American Catholic Historical Society, to reside at Rome.

28. Mgr. Averardi, the newly appointed Apostolic Delegate to Mexico, leaves Rome for his post.

29. Informal unveiling of the P. Marquette statue at the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MARCH.

4. Death of Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, Mo.

12. Death of Cardinal Aegidius Mauri, O. P., Archbishop of Ferrara. Born December 9, 1828. Created Cardinal December 2, 1895.

15. "Laetare" medal of Notre Dame University formally presented to General William S. Rosecrans.

19. Cardinal Taschereau, of Quebec, Canada, celebrates the silver jubilee of his episcopal ordination.

By the Apostolic Letter *De Ratione Concordi Rei Catholicae apud Orientales Provehendae*, Pope Leo XIII—*Motu*

Proprio—regulates the intercourse between the Clergy of the Greek and Latin Rites.

20. Rt. Rev. John L. Spaulding, Bishop of Peoria, received in Papal audience.

22. Rt. Rev. Michael J. Hoban, D. D., consecrated Coadjutor Bishop of Scranton.

APRIL.

5. Cardinals Gibbons, Logue and Vaughan issue an appeal to the English-speaking nations in favor of establishing an international tribunal of arbitration.

9. Public reception to Cardinal Satolli by the Clergy of St. Louis, Mo.

10. Death of Rt. Rev. Stephen V. Ryan, Bishop of Buffalo.

12. Anniversary celebration of the Coronation of Leo XIII (transferred from the 3d of March on account of the disasters of the Italian army in Africa).

18. Rt. Rev. Thomas O'Gorman consecrated Bishop of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, at St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C.

23. Mgr. Agliardi, Nuncio at Vienna, appointed Extraordinary Ambassador for the Coronation of Nicholas II, Emperor of Russia.

28. Rt. Rev. James Browne, Bishop of Ferns, received in Papal audience.

29. The Senate of the United States formally accepts the statue of P. Marquette, S. J.

30. Reception to Cardinal Satolli at Georgetown University, D. C.

MAY.

2. Rt. Rev. John Virtue, Bishop of Portsmouth, received in Papal audience.

7. Rt. Rev. Richard Lacey, Bishop of Middleborough, and Rt. Rev. William Gordon, Bishop of Leeds, received in Papal audience.

Death of Card. Louis Galimberti. Born April 25, 1836. Created Cardinal January 16, 1893.

10. Archbishop Kain, of St. Louis, Mo., receives the Pallium.

11. Most Rev. Cornelius O'Brien, Archbishop of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and Rt. Rev. Michael Howley, Bishop of St. Johns, Newfoundland, received in Papal audience.

18. General Convention of German Catholic Societies in Pittsburg, Pa.

Pope Leo XIII called upon to arbitrate the dispute in regard to the frontier between San Domingo and Hayti.

20. Golden Jubilee of the Sisters Servants of the Immaculate Heart, at Villa Maria, West Chester, Pa.

JUNE.

3. The Senate of the Republic of Brazil votes thanks and congratulations to Leo XIII for the solution of the difficulty between the Argentine Confederation and Chili.

10. Golden Jubilee of the priesthood of Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

20. Dedication of monument to John Boyle O'Reilly, at Boston, Mass.

21. Seventy-fifth anniversary of the First Holy Communion of Pope Leo.

—. Cornerstone of the Catholic Protectory, Philadelphia, laid by Archbishop Ryan.

22. Secret Consistory.—Mgr. Dom. M. Jacobini, Nuncio Apostolic for Portugal; Mgr. Anth. Agliardi, Nuncio Apostolic for Austria; Mgr. Dom. Ferrata, Nuncio Apostolic for France, and Mgr. Ser. Cretoni, Nuncio Apostolic for Spain, created Cardinals.

23. Inauguration of the Academic Union of the students of Maynooth College.

25. Public Consistory. Red Hat conferred upon Cardinals Perraud, Sembratowicz, Haller, Cascajares y Azara, Boyer and Casanas y Pages.

The following Bishops were preconized in the same Consistory:

To the Titular See of Gerapolis, Rt. Rev. Francis Mora, transferred from the See of Monterey—Los Angeles, Cal.

To the Titular See of Echino, Rt. Rev. Alfred Curtis, transferred from the See of Wilmington, Del.

To the Titular See of Alali, Rt. Rev. Michael J. Hoban, deputed Coadjutor with future succession to Rt. Rev. William O'Hara, Bishop of Scranton, Pa.

To the Titular See of Pinara, Rt. Rev. John J. Glennon, deputed Coadjutor to Rt. Rev. John J. Hogan, Bishop of Kansas City, Mo.

To the Titular See of Epiphania, Rt. Rev. Francis Bourne, deputed Coadjutor with future succession to Rt. Rev. John Butt, Bishop of Southwark.

To the Titular See of Amicle, Rev. Patrick Foley, deputed Coadjutor with future succession to the Rt. Rev. James Lynch, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.

To the Titular See of Justinianopolis, Rt. Rev. Hugh McSherry, deputed Coadjutor with future succession to Rt. Rev. Dr. Strobino, Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District of the Cape of Good Hope.

29. Rt. Rev. John J. Glennon is consecrated Coadjutor Bishop of Kansas City, Mo.

JULY.

3. Cardinal Francis Segna appointed Archivist of the Holy See.

11. Death of Cardinal Joseph C. E. Bourret, Bishop of Rodez. Born December 9, 1827. Preconized Bishop of Rodez, July 19, 1871. Created Cardinal June 12, 1893.

12. Catholic Summer School of America opens its fifth session at Cliff Haven (Dioc. of Ogdensburg).

14. National Convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians opens at Detroit, Mich.

—. Death of Cardinal Raphael Monaco La Valetta, Bishop of Albano. Born February 23, 1827. Created Cardinal March 13, 1868.

17. Mgr. Taliani, Titular Archbishop of Sebaste, appointed Nuncio Apostolic for Austria.

24. Golden Jubilee of the establishment of the See of Portland, Oregon.

28. Very Rev. Sebastian Martinelli, Prior General of the Hermits of St. Augustine, appointed Delegate Apostolic to the United States of America.

Mgr. Andrew Aniti, Titular Archbishop of Damiette, Nuncio Apostolic for Bavaria, appointed Nuncio Apostolic for Portugal.

Mgr. Joseph Francisco Nava di Bontifè, Archbishop of Catania, Nuncio Apostolic for Belgium, appointed Nuncio Apostolic for Spain.

31. Silver Jubilee of the Rt. Rev. S. C. Messmer, D.D., of Green Bay, Mich.

AUGUST.

2. Rt. Rev. Hugh McSherry, Coadjutor to the Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District of the Cape of Good Hope, consecrated at Dundalk, County Louth, Ireland.

—. The members of the Third American National Pilgrimage received in audience after the Papal Mass in the Vatican (Pauline Chapel).

5. Twenty-sixth Annual Convention of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union opened in St. Louis, Mo.

7. Mgr. Macarius, Papal Envoy to the Negus, received with honors by King Menelik.

10. Death of Rt. Rev. Jeremiah O'Sullivan, Bishop of Mobile, Ala.

12. Dedication of the New York Diocesan Seminary (St. Joseph's) at Dunwoodie, near Yonkers, N. Y.

13. Mgr. Aristide Rinaldini appointed Nuncio Apostolic for Belgium.

15. Lord Russell, Chief Justice of England, arrives in New York.

19. Annual Convention of the Irish Catholic Benevolent Union of the United States, at Wilmington, Del.

30. Mgr. Sebastian Martinelli, Delegate Apostolic to the United States, consecrated Archbishop of Ephesus by Cardinal Rampolla, in St. Augustine's Church, Rome.

SEPTEMBER.

6. Centennial celebration of the founding of St. Augustine's Church, Philadelphia.

8. Opening of the St. Louis Diocesan Synod.

11. Pope Leo XIII approves the Anti-Masonic Congress to be held at Trent on the 26th inst.

13. Pope Leo XIII issues Encyclical Letter *Apostolicae Curae* on Anglican Order.

19. Death of Rt. Rev. Martin Marty, D.D., O.S.B., Bishop of St. Cloud, Minn.

20. Pope Leo XIII issues Encyclical Letter *Fidentem piumque* on the Rosary.

22. Twenty-second Annual Convention of the "Catholic Young Men's National Union of Literary Societies," New York.

23. Rt. Rev. Thomas Labrecque, Bishop of Chicoutimi, Canada, received in Papal audience.

24. The Golden Jubilee of the Academy of the Visitation, Frederick City, Md.

26. International Anti-Masonic Congress opens at Trent.

28. Mgr. Benedict Lorenzelli appointed Nuncio Apostolic for Bavaria.

29. Resignation of the Rt. Rev. John J. Keane from the Rectorship of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

OCTOBER.

3. Arrival of Most Rev. Sebastian Martinelli, O. S. A., Delegate Apostolic to the United States.

9. Death of Cardinal Gaetano De Ruggiero. Born January 12, 1816. Created Cardinal May 27, 1889.

11. Golden Episcopal Jubilee of Archbishop Murphy, of Hobart, Tasmania.

13. Reception in honor of the Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. S. Martinelli, O. S. A., at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

15. Mgr. Gravel, Bishop of Nicolet, Canada, received in Papal audience.

17. Departure for Rome of Cardinal Satolli, late Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

21. The Directors of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., meet for the nomination of a successor to Bishop Keane as Rector.

22. Annual meeting of the Archbishops of the United States at the Catholic University (McMahon Hall), Washington, D. C.

23. Mgr. Clari, Bishop of Viterbo, appointed Nuncio Apostolic for France.

25. English pilgrims assist at the Pope's Mass in the Throne-room.

30. Mgr. Bégin, Coadjutor to the Archbishop of Quebec, received in Papal audience.

—. Death of Cardinal Gustave Adolphe Hohenlohe. Born February 26, 1823. Created Cardinal June 22, 1866.

NOVEMBER.

2. Golden Jubilee of Sr. Louise of St. John Ev. and Sr. Ann, Carmelite Convent, Baltimore, Md.

4. Silver Jubilee of Overbrook Seminary (St. Charles Borromeo, Philadelphia).

14. Rt. Rev. Francis Mora, D. D., former Bishop of Monterey and Los Angeles, returns to Spain, where he proposes to spend the remainder of his days.

15. Diamond jubilee of Gonzaga College (Jesuit), Washington, D. C.

17. Rt. Rev. James A. McFaul, Bishop of Trenton, N. J., arrives in Rome (visit *ad limina*).

Rt. Rev. Mgr. Brownlow, D. D., Bishop of Clifton, arrives in Rome (visit *ad limina*).

Rt. Rev. Mgr. Whiteside, D. D., Bishop of Liverpool, arrives in Rome (visit *ad limina*).

23. Appointment by Pontifical Letter of Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., of Worcester, Mass., as Rector of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

30. Canon Joseph Prisco and Mgr. Raphael Pierotti created Cardinals in Secret Consistory.

DECEMBER.

3. Cardinals Satolli, Ferrata, Agliardi, Jacobini, Cretoni, Pierotti and Prisco receive the Cardinal's Hat in Public Consistory.

–. Preconization in Consistory of Most Rev. Sebastian Martinelli, as Archbishop of Ephesus.

–. Rt. Rev. Edward J. O'Dea preconized Bishop of Nesqually, Oregon. (Consistory).

–. Very Rev. E. F. Prendergast, V. G. of Philadelphia, preconized Titular Bishop of Scillio, i. p. i., and Auxiliary of Philadelphia. (Consistory).

5. Rt. Rev. John J. Keane, D. D., leaves for Rome to enter upon his new appointment.

13. Rev. James E. Quigley, D. D., appointed Bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.

15. Rev. Hugh T. Henry elected President of the American Catholic Historical Society, Philadelphia.

16. Death of Cardinal J. P. Boyer. Born July 27, 1829. Created Cardinal November 29, 1895.

19. Death of Rt. Rev. James Lynch, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.

ANALECTA.

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE.

DE NOVO LYCEI WASHINGTONIENSIS RECTORE DESIGNATO.

Dilecto Filio Nostro Jacobo Tit. S. Mariae Trans Tiberim, S. R. E. Presbytero Card. Gibbons, Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi, Baltimoram.

LEO PP. XIII

DILECTE FILI NOSTER, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Quas, a conventu Washingtoniae habito ad alterum Lycei magni moderatorem designandum, litteras ad nos dedisti, libenter admodum accepimus ; quod ex iis alacrem pervidimus voluntatem vestram Lycei ipsius utilitatibus decorique prospiciendi. Postulationibus autem vestris annuentes, trium virorum nomina cognovimus, quos Rectoris muneri gerendo indicastis : ex quibus qui primo est loco Nos deligendum Nostraque auctoritate per hasce litteras probandum duximus ; nimirum Thomam Jacobum Conaty, ad huc Vorcestriensem curionem aestivaeque, quam dicitis, scholae praefectum. Cujus quidem viri egregii et scientiarum peritia et religiosae rei promovendae ardor, quem communi suffragio commendatis, optimam injiciunt spem, fore ut ejus opera rationibus Lycei curandis splendorique augendo non parce sit valitura. Id sane Nobis quantum in votis sit, satis est vobis superque exploratum : nostis etenim qua diligentiarum assiduitate Lycei hujus institutionem curavimus, ut eam merito in illis connumeremus, quae, ad patriae vestrae laudem provehendam, in religionis scientiarumque praesidium, lubentiore animo optatum, opitulante Deo, ad exitum perduximus. Interea cœlestium gratiarum auspicem praecipuaeque benevolentiae Nostrae testem, tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, novo Universitatis Praesidi, universoque Doctorum Collegio apostolicam benedictionem amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die xxiii Novembris MDCCCXCVI, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo nono.

LEO PP. XIII.

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. It will be readily understood that, as there are topics in Moral Theology which may not be discussed in public print, so there are reasons why we cannot undertake to conduct purely private, professional correspondence. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, unless they have been discussed in previous recent numbers of the REVIEW.

THE DATES OF EPISCOPAL ELECTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES,

ON WHICH COMMEMORATION IS TO BE MADE IN THE OFFICE.

Some time ago (See AM. ECCL. REVIEW, Sept., 1896, p. 314) we directed attention to a current doubt regarding the exact date on which Bishops are to celebrate the anniversary of their promotion to the Episcopal dignity.

A letter of the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda to one of our Metropolitans settles the doubt by the following resolution :

If the Bishop were preconized in Consistory, even after his consecration and induction into office, the anniversary of his election is to be determined from the date of the Consistory; if his election were not published in Consistory it is to be dated from the date of the Apostolic Brief of appointment.

As there is some confusion on this subject in the *Directories* and *Ordos* of this year—the Baltimore editor alone having ascertained the correct dates—we append a list of the Episcopal election dates, kindly furnished us by the latter.[1]

1 In cases where a Bishop was transferred to a new See, only the date of his translation is given, which alone is to be commemorated.

		Election Consistory.	*Consecration.*
BALTIMORE,	James Cardinal Gibbons,	**29 May, 73,	16 Aug., 68
Charleston,	Henry P. Northrop,	15 March, 83,	8 Jan., 82.
Richmond,	A. Van de Vyver,	30 Dec., 89,	20 Oct., 89.
Savannah,	Thomas A. Becker,	10 June, 86,	16 Aug., 68.
St. Augustine,	John Moore,	†16 Febr., 77,	13 May, 77.
Wheeling,	Patrick J. Donahue,	18 May, 94,	8 April, 94.
Wilmington,	Vacant,		
Vic. Apost., N. Carolina,	Leo Haid	1 June, 88,	1 July, 88.
BOSTON,	John J. Williams,	8 Jan., 66,	11 March, 66.
Burlington,	Louis de Goesbriand,	†29 July, 53,	30 Oct., 53.
Hartford,	Michael Tierney,	18 May, 94,	22 Febr., 94.
Manchester,	Dennis M. Bradley,	10 Nov., 84,	11 June, 84.
Portland, Maine,	James A. Healey,	†12 Febr., 75,	2 June, 75.
Providence	Matthew J. Harkins,	†11 Febr., 87,	14 April, 87.
Springfield	Thomas D. Beaven,	†Aug., 92,	18 Oct., 92.
CHICAGO,	Patrick A. Feehan,	†10 Sept., 80,	1 Nov., 65.
Alton,	James Ryan,	†28 Febr., 88,	1 May, 88,
Belleville,	John Janssen,	†28 Febr., 88,	25 April, 88.
Peoria,	John L. Spaulding,	†27 Nov., 76,	1 May, 77.
CINCINNATI,	William H. Elder,	†30 Jan., 80,	3 May, 57.
Cleveland,	Ignatius F. Horstmann,	14 Dec., 91,	25 Febr., 92.
Columbus,	John A. Waterson,	20 Aug., 80,	8 Aug., 80.
Covington,	Camillus P. Maes,	10 Nov., 84,	25 Jan, 85.
Detroit,	John S. Foley,	11 Febr., 89,	4 Nov., 88.
Fort Wayne,	Joseph Rademacher,	18 May, 94,	24 June, 83.
Grand Rapids,	Henry J. Richter,	15 March, 83,	22 April, 83.
Louisville,	William McCloskey,	16 March, 68,	24 May, 68.
Nashville,	Thomas S. Byrne,		25 July, 94.
Vincennes,	Francis S. Chatard,	†26 March, 78,	12 May, 78.
DUBUQUE,	John Hennessy,	22 June, 66,	30 Sept., 66.
Cheyenne,	Vacant		
Davenport,	Henry Cosgrove,	10 Nov., 84,	14 Sept., 84.
Lincoln,	Thomas Bonacum,	† 9 Aug., 87,	30 Nov., 87.
Omaha,	Richard Scannell,	4 June, 91,	30 Nov., 87.
MILWAUKEE,	Frederick X. Katzer,	4 June, 91,	21 Sept., 86.
Green Bay,	Sebastian G. Messmer,	14 Dec., 91,	27 March, 92.
La Crosse,	James Schwebach,	14 Dec., 91,	25 Febr., 92.
Marquette,	John Vertin,	12 May, 79,	14 Sept., 79.
NEW ORLEANS,	Francis Janssens,	11 Febr., 89,	1 May, 88.
Dallas,	Edward J. Dunne,	18 May, 94,	30 Nov., 93.
Galveston,	Nicholas A. Gallagher,	16 Jan., 93,	30 Apr., 82.
Little Rock,	Edward Fitzgerald,	22 June, 66,	3 Febr., 67.
Mobile,	Vacant,		
Natchez,	Thomas Heslin,	11 Febr., 89,	18 June, 89.
Natchitoches,	Anthony Durier,	†19 Dec., 84,	19 March, 85.
San Antonio,	John A. Forest,		28 Oct., 95.

** This sign † indicates the date of the Bull of Election, the Election having never been proclaimed in the Consistory.

		Election Consistory.	*Consecration.*
Vic. Apost., Brownsville,	Peter Verdaguer,	4 June, 91,	9 Nov., 90.
Vic. Apost., Indian Ter.,	Theoph. Meerschaert,	4 June, 91,	8 Sept., 91.
NEW YORK,	Michael A. Corrigan,	†1 Oct., 80,	4 May, 73.
Albany,	Thomas M. A. Burke,	18 May, 94,	1 July, 94.
Brooklyn,	Charles E. McDonnell,	†11 Nov., 92,	25 Apr., 92.
Buffalo,	James E. Quigley,		
Newark,	Michael W. Wigger,	4 Aug., 81,	18 Oct., 81.
Ogdensburg,	Henry Gabriele,	†20 Dec., 92,	5 May, 92.
Rochester,	Bernard J. McQuaid,	13 March, 68,	12 July, 68.
Syracuse,	Patrick A. Ludden,	†14 Dec., 86,	1 May, 87.
Trenton,	James A. McFaul,	†20 July, 94,	18 Oct, 94.
OREGON CITY,	William H. Gross,	27 July, 85,	27 Apr., 73.
Boise City,	A. J. Glorieux,	18 May, 94,	19 Apr., 85.
Helena,	John B. Brondel,	†7 March, 84,	14 Dec., 79.
Nesqually,	Edward J. O'Dea,	Dec. 3, 96.	
Vancouver's Island,	John N. Lemmens,	1 June, 88,	5 Aug., 88.
PHILADELPHIA,	Patrick J. Ryan,	10 Nov., 84,	14 Apr., 72.
Erie,	Tobias Mullen,	16 March, 68,	2 Aug., 68.
Harrisburg,	Thomas McGovern,	†6 Dec., 87,	11 March, 88.
Pittsburg,	Richard Phelan,	30 July, 85,	2 Aug. 85.
Scranton,	William O'Hara,	13 March, 68,	12 July, 68.
ST. LOUIS,	John Jos. Kain,	15 June, 93,	23 May, 75.
Concordia,	Vacant,		
Kansas City (Kansas),	Louis M. Fink,	†22 May, 77,	11 June, 71.
Kansas City (Mo.),	John J. Hogan,	10 Sept., 80,	13 Sept., 68.
St. Joseph,	Maurice F. Burke,	15 June, 95,	28 Oct., 87.
Wichita,	John J. Hennessey,	11 Febr., 89,	30 Nov., 88.
ST. PAUL,	John Ireland,	†12 Febr., 75,	21 Dec., 75.
Duluth,	James McGolrick,	30 Dec., 89,	27 Dec., 89.
Jamestown,	John Shanley,	30 Dec., 89,	27 Dec., 89.
St. Cloud,	Vacant,		
Sioux Falls,	Thomas O'Gorman,		
Winona,	Joseph B. Cotter,	30 Dec., 89,	27 Dec., 89.
SAN FRANCISCO,	Patrick W. Riordan,	9 Aug., 83,	19 Sept., 83.
Los Angeles & Monterey,	George Montgomery,	18 May, 94,	8 April, 94.
Sacramento,			
Salt Lake,	Lawrence Scanlan,	4 June, 91,	29 June, 87.
SANTA FÉ,	Placide L. Chapelle,	14 Dec., 91,	1 Nov., 91.
Denver,	Nicholas C. Matz,	25 Nov., 87,	28 Oct., 87.
Vic. Apost., Arizona,	P. Bourgade,	27 March, 85,	1 May, 85.

COLOR OF THE STOLE USED IN THE BLESSING OF ST. BLASE.

Qu. EDITOR AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Being aware of the great influence the REVIEW has obtained, and justly obtained, in matters liturgical as well as moral and canonical, I judge it important to direct attention to a matter in which I fear a former decision of the REVIEW may cause some lack of uniformity. To the query, "Which is the color of the stole in the blessing of St. Blase?" the REVIEW, vol. xiv, p. 270, replies: The color is *that of the Mass.*

Linzer Quartal-Schrift, 1883, p. 732, says it is red.

The Rituale Romano-Eystettense, p. 279: demissa casula . . . alias indutus superpelliceo et stola rubei coloris. The Ordo for that diocese gives "in stola rubra" in italics.

I have not the Ritual of Ratisbon at hand, but I know that the practice there is to use the red stole.

Hausherr, Comp. Cerem., p. 51: vel alias superpelliceo et stola rubra.

From Da Carpo, Comp. Bibl. Liturg. pars. 4, n. 39, it would appear that this blessing is also given with a relic of St. Blase. Now, admitting that the blessing with the relic of a martyr is given with a red stole (I hope no "petitio principii"), it is not probable that the blessing is given in white stole when candles are used.

From the context of "In Una Vercell." d. 20, Mart., 1869, Muehlbaur, *Decreta authent,* Supplem. iii, p. 476, I would also conclude that the stole is red.

Wapelhorst and De Herdt say nothing to the contrary, nor does the Rituale Romanum.

The Rubric quoted in the REVIEW, vol. xiv, p. 270, I can not find in the Missal, but suspect that in some Missals it is given at the end of the Mass "Sacerdotes," *i. e.*, the *proprio ex indulto.* In that case it is plain that the celebrant retains the stole of the Mass. The "Benedictionale Constantiense," p. 4, in a note to the general rule, that the stole is taken *pro ratione temporis vel festi,* asserts: "In Benedictionibus, *nulli* certo tempori, aut festo vel *Sancto* propriis color albus plerumque adhibetur, nisi Benedictio sit conjuncta cum Exorcismo, quo casu congrue adhibetur color violaceus."

In the same Benedictionale, p. 34, there is (preceding the benedictio collorum) a benedictio panis, etc., in honorem S. Blasii: "Si

fidelis populus voluerit ad Ecclesiam deferre panem, vinum, etc., ante vel post *missam in honorem S. Blassii* Ep. M. contra malum anginae. . . .'' This, I think, explains why rubricists do not mention the color of the stole,—it seems natural : color diei.

Indeed, where I find the color given, it is invariably the red. Until I saw in the REVIEW that another color could be used, it never struck me that any other color but red was used the world over. I admit that the color of the Mass *may be* used, when the blessing is given immediately after it, but it is not the color which *is to be* used.

Resp. In contending for the use of a stole corresponding in color to the office of the day we followed the general rule laid down by De Herdt (vol. i, n. 152), and Wapelhorst (n. 311): "In omni benedictione extra Missam sacerdos stola pro ratione temporis, *i. e.*, offiici diei, utatur *nisi aliter in Missali vel in Rituali notetur.*"

The Ritual, at the end of the *Benedictio Candelarum in festo S. Blasii*, has the following rubric: "Deinde sacerdos terminata Missa; deposita casula et manipulo, accensis duobus cereis . . dicat,'' etc.

It is true the latter rubric in all probability refers to the mass of St. Blase, but the fact is not stated, and we have an analogous case sanctioning the use of the color of the day in the *Benedictio cum SS. Sacramento*, when given immediately after mass, although the proper color of the Bl. Sacrament is white.

Hence, when asked which of two authorities we would make our own, we decided as we did, since if there is question of uniformity, nothing would be gained by repeating two divergent opinions.

However, we must confess that the arguments and authorities cited by our reverend correspondent, who is evidently a careful student of liturgical observance, make us quite inclined to concur with his resolution, to wit:—that the color of the mass *may be* used when the blessing is given immediately after it, but that it is not the color which is prescribed.

THE "ORDO" AND PRIVATE FUNERAL MASSES ON DOUBLE FEASTS.

The omission of a late Decree from the *Monita* of several *Ordos*, as noted in our Book Review, leads us to repeat here the statement of the very acceptable privilege granted by the S. Congregation in regard to the celebration of Funeral Masses.

According to the terms of the Indult, which is of universal application, a *low* mass *de Requie* may be celebrated *in die* vel *pro die obitus* aut *depositionis* on any day throughout the year except on *duplicia I classis* and on *festa de praecepto;* in other words, on any day on which heretofore it was licit to celebrate a solemn Exequial Requiem under the same conditions—namely, that the corpse be present, or unburied, or within two days after the burial. The latter extension is due no doubt to the fact that in some countries the civil law insists on burial within twenty-four hours after the death of a person has been duly certified by a physician.

We append the text of the Decree:

Quibuslibet Ecclesiis et Oratoriis quum publicis tum privatis et in Sacellis ad Seminaria, Collegia et Religiosas vel pias utriusque sexus Communitates spectantibus, Missas privatas de Requie, praesente, insepulto, vel etiam sepulto non ultra biduum, cadavere, fieri posse die vel pro die obitus aut depositionis; verum sub clausulis et conditionibus, quibus, juxta Rubricas et Decreta, Missa solemnis de Requie iisdem in casibus decantatur, exceptis duplicibus primae classis et Festis de praecepto.—(S. R. C., 19 Maji, 1896.)

DOES THE QUESTION OF ANGLICAN ORDERS ADMIT OF FURTHER INVESTIGATION?

Qu. As the late decree of the Pope declaring the nullity of Anglican Orders is not an infallible utterance, does it not leave the question as it was, a case for further investigation? Of course, it commands and will receive the obedient acceptance of all Catholics,

as a matter of submission to law. This, however, does not make belief in its being infallible as a matter of divine Catholic faith necessary.

May it not be somewhat like the decree of Pope Stephen, who ordered all who had received ordinations from his predecessor, Formosus, to be re-ordained? I. N.

Resp. The Pontifical Decision regarding the nullity of Anglican Orders is not of a nature to command the same internal assent which is to be given to an infallible utterance regarding a doctrine of faith or morals. It is a judicial sentence as to the proper application of certain laws or forms to an established fact. Hence, it is a misapprehension on the part of Anglicans to assume that the Pope pretends to settle an historical fact by an appeal to infallible authority, that is to say, as if the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost had revealed to him the nature of such a fact. Not at all. The Pontiff simply collects all the accessible evidence which establishes beyond human doubt the credibility of a certain fact. Having ascertained that fact he pronounces that it stands as an infallible evidence that the Anglican Orders administered for a full century were *not the same as the priestly Orders of the Catholic Church, and that the difference*, as he shows, *was one of essentials.*

Nor can the fact, upon which the Papal judgment rests its logical conclusion of the invalidity of Anglican Orders, be held as doubtful. It is admitted by Anglicans, as well as by those who differ from them (and fully established by documents at hand and known to both parties) that the Edwardian Ritual was used (by law established) in the entire Anglican communion for more than three generations. If the heads of a church make a public avowal of protestantism in the expressed sense of excluding a priestly ministry (such as is conveyed in the priestly Orders as administered from the days of St. Augustine in England); if that same form of protestantism is declared by the supreme ministers of state to be the religion of the land; if it is incorporated in the ritual book which declared the norm of public worship; if it is

acknowledged in the confessions of the apologists and theologists of the Anglican establishment down to the present day —you cannot say that this protestantism was *not a fact*, nor that it was Catholicism. It boots nothing that some modern Anglicans of a more pronounced tendency toward the old forms of worship call the Edwardian Ritual a Catholic Ritual, and hence claim the validity of the Orders administered according to its forms. Surely we who are Catholics, by the admission of all—at least so far as our sacramental worship and the sacerdotal continuity is concerned—should know what Catholic Orders are, and what the Church holds them to be. Indeed, our chief theologian, the Pope, is the very one who is asked for an expression on a subject which he must surely be at home with, and which he could not very well distort or exaggerate to the prejudice of anyone, for there are some more theologians, past and present, who have had knowledge on the same subject, and who establish an important recourse to the fountain of Catholic truth.

Hence, as the fact of the use of the Edwardian form is unquestioned, and as the difference between that form and the Catholic form in essentials is easily ascertained, the Pope did not have to seek information beyond that of historical evidence and Catholic doctrine. What he had to do was to show his readiness to have the topic discussed, lest any one be kept from the fold by false pretence or the influence of blinded guides. The Papal utterance thus stands, not as an infallible declaration, but as a judicial sentence which practically admits of no appeal or reversal. I say practically, because the possibility of a further discussion theoretically is not excluded by the Papal document. It may, indeed, be that not all the facts concerning the Edwardian ordination have been ascertained. Nevertheless one thing is assured, that, whatever facts may come to light, *they cannot alter the evidence at hand.* They may cause new investigation and fresh discussion, not with a view of changing the verdict of Leo XIII, which is that of his predecessors only confirmed, but in order to satisfy anxious minds who have been led to think there is no evidence against Anglicanism.

Yet even this chance of ever having the question recalled for examination by the Holy See is practically null; each past declaration has lessened the probability of a reopening. There has been no changing in the judgment of the highest court of appeal for three centuries, and Leo's words do not indicate the likelihood of a change in the future. "Wherefore," says the Pontiff, "strictly adhering in this matter to the decrees of the Pontiffs, our predecessors, confirming them most fully, and, as it were, renewing them by our authority, of our own motion and certain knowledge, we pronounce and declare that the ordinations conferred according to the Anglican rite have been, and are, absolutely null and void."

"The test of the spiritual man is his conformity to the mind of the Church. *Sentire cum Ecclesia* in dogma, discipline, traditions, devotions, customs, opinions, sympathies, is the countersign that the work in our hearts is not from the diabolical spirit, nor from the human, but from the divine."—(Card. Manning. Introd. to *Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, p. vi.)

CONSECRATION OF ALTARS IN AN INDEBTED CHURCH.

Qu. Many years ago the church to which I am attached was consecrated. Of this I have unquestionable evidence, although the altars which were in the church at the time were movable; that is to say, they were wooden structures without solid foundation. Subsequently we had marble altars built, resting upon a solid basis of stone, as prescribed for fixed altars.

Can we have these altars consecrated without having the church reconsecrated? And can this be done whilst there remains still a debt of several thousand dollars on the church?

Resp. Though it is contrary to the prescribed form of the Pontifical to have a church consecrated without consecrating the altar (altare fixum), the consecration is nevertheless valid and remains. There is no prohibition against having the altars separately consecrated, to complete the entire rite.

We published a short time ago a Decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, in which this doubt was practically solved. To this question: *An Ecclesia in cujus consecratione omissa fuit consecratio altaris, habenda sit valide consecrata?* the answer given was: *Affirmative nempe valide*; sed non licite nisi habeatur Apostolica dispensatio quamvis aliqua, vel omnia altaria jam consecrata reperiantur. (See AM. ECCL. REVIEW, Oct., 1896, p. 414.)

As to whether the consecration of the altars may take place before the debt of several thousand dollars has been liquidated, would depend on the risk which is involved in the debt. The Canon Law of the Church forbids the alienation and reversion of consecrated property to profane uses. Hence, to preclude all risks of such property being seized for non-payment of debt upon it, it is forbidden to formally consecrate a church and altar to the service of God before the same are paid for—practically.

In the present case this can perhaps be assumed as done, if the debt arises from improvements which are in no wise likely to involve the ownership of the property. There remain probably always some debts on churches even after they have been consecrated, which are equal to current expenses. The principle on which such questions are to be decided must, however, be plain from what we have said above.

S. ROSA DE LIMA, VIRGO.

PATRONA PRINCIPALIS AMERICAE.

In all the Mexican and South American "Officia et Calendaria Propria," recently approved by the Congregation of the Sacred Rites, S. Rose of Lima is honored with the title of *Patrona Americae.*

The Proprium of Chili, of Buenos Ayres and Montevideo gives her the title of *Patrona Principalis totius Americae;* the "Propria" of Ecuador, Columbia, Costa Rica and Guatemala call her *Patrona Praecipua Americae;* the Mexican

Ordines style her: *Patrona principalis utriusque Americae* (de las Americas); in the Ordo of Havana, Merida and Manila she bears the title *Patrona Praecipua Indiarum.*

Accordingly her feast is a *duplex I classis cum octava* in all South America, the Republics of Central America and Mexico, and in most of these countries they recite the very beautiful *officium proprium S. Rosae*, taken from the Dominican breviary.

If S. Rose is acknowledged by the Congregation of the Sacred Rites to be the *Patrona Principalis totius Americae* (post B. Mariam V. de Conceptione Immaculata), why do not also we in the United States and Canada celebrate her feast *sub ritu I. classis cum octava*, which is due to the Patronus Principalis? Why have the dioceses of the United States never acknowledged this patronatus of the Flower of Peru?

Certainly S. Rose was declared Patron of all America at a time when there were no bishops and hardly any Catholic priests or layman within the limits of the present United States; and afterwards, when the country became settled, this privilege of S. Rose remained perhaps unknown to the hierarchy of North America, since the connection between the English-speaking countries of America and those which use the Spanish and Portuguese languages was very slender.

Would it not be just now to do what has been neglected all these hundred years, and give to our American S. Rose the honor which is due her by a just and accorded title?

F. G. H.

INCENSE AT THE "EXEQUIAE" WITHOUT MASS.

Qu. I am located in a town where there are two Irish-American Catholic churches with pastors, each having assistants, one of whom is the writer of this query. With regard to certain rubrics there is quite a discrepancy between both these churches, viz.:

Pastor A. never uses incense at funeral services when giving the absolution, unless in conjunction with a *missa cantata de Requie*, and then only because it was an established custom before his

advent in the parish. Incense, according to him, is allowed only in the *Exequiae* which follow the *missa solemnis de Requie.*

Pastor B., on the other hand, uses incense invariably whenever he performs the absolution, whether it takes place after a *missa solemnis*, or *cantata*, or *privata* (*de Requie*) or even when there is no Mass at all.

Now, I have looked up the different rubrics bearing on this matter and find no mention anywhere about the use of incense at the simple *exequiae* unless in connection with the *missa solemnis;* nor have I seen it used anywhere before I became attached to this church, so that I am inclined to follow Pastor A.'s interpretation of the rubrics.

If Pastor B. is wrong, can he establish a custom of this kind and oblige his assistants to observe the same? The Bishop of the diocese has forbidden the use of incense at a *missa cantata*, but I am not sure that this prohibition would affect the question of the *exequiae.*

Would you kindly state in your next issue, if possible, who is right—Pastor A. or Pastor B.?

ASSISTANT.

Resp. If Pastor B. were wrong he could not lawfully establish a custom contrary to the rubrics, much less oblige his assistants to observe the same. But he is right.

The ceremonies to be observed in the *absolutio ad tumbam* are prescribed in the *Rituale Romanum.* They are the same always, whether there be Mass or not. The Church supposes, indeed, that the *exequies* are as a rule performed with a Mass, unless the occurrence of a great feast or some actual necessity makes it impossible. Hence the last rubric of the Ritual reads: "Missa vero, *si hora fuerit congruens . . .* non omittatur, *nisi obstet magna diei solemnitas, aut aliqua necessitas aliter suadeat,*" etc. But the omission of the Mass or of the "Office for the Dead" does not change the rite, and this is the reason why no special mention is made of the use of incense. "If neither the Office nor the Mass for the dead is celebrated," says Pighi,[1] "the celebrant

1 Liturgia Sacra, n. 180.

begins the oration *Non intres*, and performs the remaining ceremonies as prescribed" (*De Absolutione ad feretrum*). In the last mentioned chapter he speaks of the usual cross-bearer, acolytes with candles, and incense. Martinucci [1] gives the same explanation.

THE "MISSA QUOTIDIANA" AD INTENTIONEM DANTIS.

Qu. In view of the late legislation on Requiem Masses, given in the October number of the REVIEW, may a priest, as before the publication of the Decree, still read the *missa quotidiana, ad intentionem dantis*, when the intention is unknown to him?

Resp. As there is nothing in the Decree which clearly excludes this liberty, we should think that it still remains the privilege of the celebrant to interpret the unknown "intention" by saying the *missa quotidiana de Requie.*

THE PRAYER AD LIBITUM IN THE MISSA DE REQUIE.

Qu. On the anniversary of the death of a friend, a priest happens to be bound to celebrate *pro determinatis defunctis.* May he add, among the prayers *ad libitum*, the one from the *Missa in Anniversario?*

Resp. The Decree leaves the celebrant of a mass "pro defuncto vel defunctis certo designatis," free to choose his first prayer among those "quae inscribuntur in missali"; the second, "ad libitum," without any restriction. Whence it may be inferred that the prayer *ex missa in anniversario* may be selected. This is in accordance with the general rule of liturgical practice, whenever a prayer is *ad libitum.*

VIRTUE OF THE BAPTISM OF DESIRE, OR OF BLOOD.

Qu. Does the Baptism of desire or of blood, besides procuring forgiveness of all sin committed before receiving it, also remit—like the sacramental Baptism—all temporal punishment due to sin?

1 Lib. iv, cap. ix, n. 44.

Resp. The *Baptism of desire*, as the term is used in Catholic doctrine, is understood to arise from an act of sorrow for sin or of love of God above creatures, together with a desire (explicit or implicit) to obtain sacramental Baptism. As such, it remits the guilt of sin, because the principal disposition required for the fulfillment of God's precept is there, and it would be unreasonable to assume that God demands further what is practically impossible under given circumstances—namely, the performance of a distinct sacramental rite.

On the other hand, the rite as instituted by Christ has a distinct virtue which attaches to its performance. Thus it impresses a character which at the same time becomes a brief, if I may use the term, for an indulgence or remission of temporal penalty. Hence, whilst sorrow for sin, or love of God, according to the relative intensity of these acts, joined to a wish to do what God desires (that is, to become formally initiated as the adopted child of Christ), remit the guilt of sin and also remit the penalty due to that guilt, they do not do so in the same degree and manner as sacramental Baptism, which remits penalty by an intrinsic virtue *ex opere operato* through the application of the merits of Christ. Of course, Christ's merits enter into an efficacious desire for Baptism, but not in the same degree. He wished that a special grace should attach to a special act, just as He wished that hands should be imposed for the communication of graces and healings, although He might have dispensed with such acts, attaching the effect to the simple desire or intention.

Hence theologians, following St. Thomas, hold (III, q. 66, a. 11) that the Baptism of desire supplies the virtue of sacramental Baptism, inasmuch as it remits the guilt of sin, and also, according to the intensity of the charity which accompanies the desire, at least partially the penalty due to sin.

The Baptism of blood also requires an act of repentance in those who have committed sin ; and when to this disposition is added the shedding of blood or the sacrifice of tem-

poral life from a supernatural motive, and in view of the promises of the Christian faith, it becomes in fact a sacramental Baptism through the medium of blood. Hence theologians hold that it remits not only the guilt, but also the penalty of sin beyond death *ex opere operato.* Cf. Palmieri —Ballerini, Vol. iv, De Bapt., sect. ii, n. 1-3.

THE PROMULGATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL STATUTES.

Qu. When a priest reads a Decree from Rome, such as the recent arrangement about the prayers of Requiem Masses, in a newspaper, even in your esteemed REVIEW, is he obliged from such notice to adopt it without any order from his Bishop? My idea is, he may, but is not obliged. Again, is a Bishop obliged from such notice of a Decree to announce it to his priests, or should he receive personal notice from the Propaganda or his Metropolitan? for many priests do not receive papers or reviews in which these Decrees are published.

Resp. He is obliged to accept such notice if the medium through which it comes is authentic (not necessarily official), and reliable (not necessarily infallible). For although the promulgation of a law is a condition of binding force, it is not required that the law should be brought to the cognizance of the individual members of a community, nor is the manner of promulgation specially determined by canon law. It is assumed in ecclesiastical as in civil legislation that when an enactment is proposed to the public through the ordinary channels of *trustworthy communication*, and under proper signature, that it becomes binding; so much so that a plea of ignorance of the law is not admitted in court after a sufficient period from its publication has elapsed. Benedict XIV, in his work, "De Synod Dioc." (xiii, 4, 1), says: "Etenim, cum lex sit regula morum, non uni aut alteri personae, sed toti proposita communitati, debet omnibus ita significari ut ad omnium aures pervenire *valeat;*" and again: "Nec sit necessarium quum constitutio solemniter editur aut publice promulgatur, ipsius notitiam singulorum auribus per

speciale mandatum vel literas inculcare, sed id solum sufficit, ut ad ejus observentiam teneatur, qui noverit eam solemniter editam aut publice promulgatam." (l. c. x, 1, 5).

The Ordinary is, of course, obliged to adopt the ordinary means calculated to facilitate the promulgation of any law which is communicated to him for the benefit of his diocesans. For this reason nearly all the various European dioceses have official ecclesiastical organs through which diocesan regulations are made known and interpreted. The publication in respectable newspapers is, if properly signed, sufficient, although this method has at times serious inconveniences. In the first place, such organs may subserve purposes and parties with which every priest in the diocese does not sympathize, and which is for him a sufficiently legitimate reason not to read the paper in question; secondly, the newspapers readily fall into the temptation of discussing the merits of the legislation, and to interpret its meaning in a way which may not meet the intention of the legislator or which lacks the sufficient knowledge and prudence in matters theological and canonical; thirdly, the authority of the Church is apt to be weakened by the indiscriminate and not always wise or reverent manner in which lay persons are led to discuss the rulings of the authority of the Church. An ecclesiastical publication, having the sanction of the proper authority, and in the hands of prudent and rightly informed men, gives all the required guarantee for the promulgation and right interpretation of the laws issued under the authority of the Church.

A diocesan publication exclusively devoted to the interests of the clergy has in some respects an advantage over a theological periodical which extends upon a wider field. A Bishop may deem it wise, for example, under circumstances, to remonstrate against the publication of a Decree or ecclesiastical enactment (even pontifical) in his diocese. In that case he is at liberty to present his reasons to the Holy See, and until he receives his answer he is not bound to publish said Decree or enactment. (Bened. xiv, l. c. ix, 8, 3.) But such cases are comparatively rare with us.

BOOK REVIEW.

PHILOSOPHIA LACENSIS sive series institutionum Philos. Scholasticae edita a presbyteris Soc. Jesu in Collegio quondam B. Mariae ad Lacum:

INSTITUTIONES PSYCHOLOGICAE secundum principia S. Thomae Aq., ad usum scholasticum accommodavit Tilm. Pesch, S. J. Pars I Psych. Naturalis. Lib I. Friburgi, Herder (St. Louis Mo.), 1896. Pp. xv, 470. Pr. $1.90.

Students of philosophy familiar with the preceding volumes of the *Cursus Lacensis* have been eagerly looking for this portion of the series allotted to Psychology. Such universal and intensely feverish interest has been excited of recent years in this branch of knowledge, especially on its empirical and physiological side, that the adherent of the traditional philosophy taught in our higher institutions of learning is naturally desirous to find how the bearings of the new on the old pyschology will be viewed by the eminent writers who have undertaken this, the most complete of our expositions of neo-scholastic philosophy. Not, of course, that any student versed in that philosophy and fairly familiar with the data of recent psychology can have any reasonable doubt as to the perfect harmony existing between the old and the new. He knows full well that not only is there here no real discord, but, on the contrary, that the recently ascertained results of experimental investigation on the organic side of psychology admirably confirm, complete and perfect the empirical content of the neo-scholastic pyschology. As to the rational or metaphysical side of the latter science, the wealth of doctrine handed on from St. Thomas, Suarez and their commentators calls for no further development, and is unlikely ever to receive such. Notwithstanding this reasonable trust in the validity of the old teaching, nay, rather because of such trust, the Catholic student cares to know in what way the most competent masters in

the schools look upon the new facts and theories—what they find desirable to assimilate, what to reject.

Confidence in the worth of this authoritative confirmation will be strengthened when it is known that the psychology of the *Cursus Lacensis* has been entrusted to Fr. Pesch. Those who are acquainted with the Logic and Natural Philosophy with which the series has been enriched by the same writer, are prepared to look for a like breadth and thoroughness of treatment of the present subject. Nor will the expectation be disappointed. One may take exception to some details in the arrangement of subjects, and may regret that here, as in the Logic, the plan calls for no little repetition of matter. Yet on the whole the science of psychology promises to be here set forth with larger views, fuller analysis, more complete development than it has ever thus far received in kindred literature. We say *promises*, for this first volume is but a small portion of the entire projected work. We have here but the analytic data of the science —the division called "natural or physical psychology," or, as the author does not object to style it, "biological psychology," or "philosophical biology." This first book is to be followed by another which will give the synthetic side explanatory of the organic functions of life) of the same portion of the total subject, and this in turn by what the author calls "anthropological" (rational or metaphysical) psychology. This second half is to fall into four parts, dealing respectively with the human intellect, the will, the relations of soul to body, the soul in its separated state. What extent of book space these divisions are to cover we are not informed.

By this it will be seen that the author takes a broad field for investigation; nothing short of the philosophy of life in the organic world. The doctrine, however, is made to converge, of course, on the *life or soul of man*—vegetable and purely animal life being studied mainly in view of the light they throw on strictly human psychology.

In the introduction the author unfolds the definition of psychology as "scientia quae ab operationibus vitalibus viventium corporeorum notis ad naturam sive essentiam primi earum principii interni, quod anima appellari solet, detgendam et declarandam analytice progreditur; et ex natura sive essentia animae detecta et declarata ad declarandum melius operationes vitales synthetice iterum regreditur." This is, of course, the initial or working definition. Its perfecting is to be the outcome of the complete study of its details. It opens out, however, at once the author's teaching as to the sources of

psychological truths and the method to be pursued in psychological research. These sources are primarily consciousness and external observation of life, human and subhuman; secondarily, the data of all the biological sciences (including pathology), of philology, history, ethnography, sociology. The method is, as the definition implies, not purely introspective, nor purely experimental, nor purely metaphysical, but a reasonable blending of all. Analytic from the start, it must by an all-around study of psychic phenomena lead to the laws and the nature of the source of those phenomena, and thence, working backward, re-explain the original data in the synthetic light of the analytically ascertained principles and theory.

Not the least important feature of the introduction is the proposition establishing the possibility of psychology as a special science, a position so often contested in recent times by those who clamor for a "psychology without a soul."

The aim in the body of the work is to determine what we can know of the nature of life. The treatment aptly runs from a general to a special current. First, living organisms are briefly described, their structure and general functions, and particularly the mechanism of sentient action. This leads first to a philosophical view of the existence and kind of life in the three living kingdoms of nature; next to a general definition of life; then to the essential difference between the living and non-living world, and to the philosophical classification of the grades of life, *i. e.*, of living beings. At this point the author re-establishes somewhat more briefly the positions he had defended at greater length in his Natural Philosophy—positions, namely, against the various theories of evolution. It is at least noteworthy that a philosopher of Fr. Pesch's recognized ability, after a re-investigation of the subject in the light of the larger literature that has in the meanwhile been devoted to it, finds no reason to abandon in the least the statements he expounded sixteen years ago.

From this stage the author's thought is focused on the principle of life as to its substantiality, its relation to "localization" in the organism, the immateriality and simplicity of the human soul, its unicity, its blending as substantial form with the body into the unity of human nature and personality; lastly, as to its origin.

The volume closes with two sections devoted to the nature of the principle of life in the brute and plant; it being shown that in both organism the "anima" possesses the prerogatives contrary to those with which the human soul is endowed.

From this hasty indication of the trend of the author's thought it will be seen that the present volume affords little occasion for the discussion of questions suggested by the new psychology. Outside of the compressed description of the nervous mechanism and sense organs, there is hardly any reference to physiological phenomena, save inasmuch as is necessary to subserve the main purpose of this portion of the work—viz., the establishing, on the data of experience, internal and external, what we can know as to the nature of the Ψυχή—the anima—the principle of life. The notions and definitions derived from this first study are to be used synthetically in the next volume, to be devoted to describing the functions of life. Here will be found the proper occasion, we presume, for explaining theories as to quality and quantity of sensation, etc. To the student not already well versed in scholastic psychology, and much more to such as are adverse to the contents and methods of that system, the present volume will appear decidedly metaphysical. These readers, seeing how the larger part of the teaching is here given to essences, substance, vital principles and the other entities supposed to have no existence outside the brain of the metaphysician, will hardly realize that the method is analytic and inductive. Little unprejudiced study, however, is needed to perceive that the data of experience are all along kept close for verification in connection with the concepts, definitions and principles they are proven to imply. At the same time we cannot but regret the method Fr. Pesch has followed, which causes him to place here at the start so large a quota of metaphysical inferences, to which again, in the after half, or rational psychology, reference must needs be made with perhaps much repetition. Here, as in the first volume of his Logic, the author presents with no meagre development the basal truths of his science—truths, as we have said, gathered in this place from empirical data. These truths must needs be reiterated and developed at greater length when the subjects connected with the intellect and will shall arise for discussion. An obvious advantage there would be, indeed, in this repetition of doctrine, were the work such as could ever be of much service to the tyro in philosophy. In view, however, of the fact that it can be utilized mainly by advanced students and professors, it would seem more satisfactory had the subjects connected with the nature and origin of the human soul been relegated for full and continuous treatment to the after part of the science, instead of dividing up the exposition as has been done.

This is, of course, a mere question of arrangement and of minor importance, militating but slightly, if at all, against a work which for its wide range of doctrine, its careful and sustained analysis, its precision and perspicuity of statement has no rival, unless, perhaps, it be the still unfinished psychology of Fr. Urraburu.

F. P. S.

HISTORIA EXERCITIORUM SPIRITUALIUM S. P. IGNATII DE LOYOLA. Collecta et concinnata a P. Ing. Diertins, S.J. Friburgi Herder (St. Louis, Mo.) Pp. 323. Pr. $1.20.

THE SCIENCE OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE ACCORDING TO THE EXERCISES. By James Clark, S.J. London and Leamington: Art and Book Co. New York: Benziger Bros. Pp. xvi, 475. Pr. $1.60.

It may be safely asserted that, outside the Bible, no book has ever been so potent for good, none has entered so deeply and so widely into the reforming and shaping of the higher lives of so many individuals, and, by consequence, none has exercised a more beneficial influence on Christian society than the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. It were idle to eulogize in type what has been lived by the Saint of Loyola himself, by the glorious band of apostles and martyrs and confessors whom he formed on the methods of the Exercises, by the many saints who to it, under God, owe the beginnings and development of their heroic sanctity, by the countless army of priests, regular and secular, by the unnumbered communities of men and women, by the innumerable multitudes of the laity of every rank and condition of life, all of whom owe to this wonderful book so much of what has been and is best in their own lives and what of good they have been able to effect in the lives of others.

Whatever, therefore, may contribute to spread and deepen the knowledge of the Exercises must be welcome—not only to the sons of St. Ignatius, but to every one whose duty and privilege it is to give its truths a living application. Two such helps, each on a different line, are offered by the two volumes at hand. One deals

with the historical aspects of the Exercises, the other unfolds systematically their contents.

The first edition of Fr. Diertins' history was issued in Rome in the year seventeen hundred. The materials that had entered into its composition were drawn chiefly from the early Lives of St. Ignatius, by Orlando, Maffei and Bartoli. From these sources the author wrought in class style a brief sketch of the Saint's life and an elaborate account of the genius and subsequent influence of the Book of Exercises. Twenty years later a second, but slightly changed edition, was called for. The present reprint contains in addition two valuable documents from the Bollandists—one furnishing, with many interesting details of the Saint's early life, a thorough vindication of the authenticity of the Exercises; the other—entitled *Gloria Posthuma S. Ignatii ex commoratione apud Manresanas*—describing the miraculous events that occurred after the death of the Saint, the subsequent history of the Manresan cave, and the influence of the Exercises in various parts of Europe.

It is the lot of great works like the Exercises and the Imitation of Christ to have their authorship questioned. Fortunately for the former what controversy was raised came so quickly in the wake of the work itself as to render vindication comparatively easy. After his conversion St. Ignatius was for some time under the spiritual guidance of Clanonius, a Benedictine monk of Montserrat, and was doubtless acquainted with the Exercitatorium of the Abbot Garcia Cisnero. Occasion was taken from this fact by a certain Constantinus Cajetanus to make the claim that the Saint had drawn *magna ex parte* the Exercises from the Libellum of Cisnero. A comparison, however, of the two books shows how utterly groundless was the charge, for they differ widely in matter, form and scope. The book of Const. Cajetanus was afterwards on other grounds placed on the Index, and a general Chapter of the Benedictine Order, held at Ravenna in 1644, solemnly disavowed all responsibility for the work of the ex-monk. Many extrinsic arguments, moreover, prove incontestably the Ignatian authorship of the Exercises. The interested reader will find them here set forth by Fr. Diertins and by the Bollandist Pinius in the Appendix. The Exercises were not, however, all written during the Saint's retreat at Manresa. The final completion given in the annotations and additions and the perfected order of the whole came only in the lapse of the succeeding twenty-five years, during which the constant use of the Exercises had taught the

Saint the special varying needs of souls beginning and advancing in the spiritual life.

Fr. Clare's work is, as its title suggests, an analysis and development of the Exercises. It opens with an abridgment which gives in a few bold strokes the contents and scope of the whole work. Then each of the parts, the method of meditation, examination of conscience, the annotations and additions, are explained. The meditations themselves for the four weeks are translated into clear English, and, when requiring it, annotated. Three appendices have been subjoined; the first giving twelve brief meditations of general application, the second containing as many more, bearing directly on the life of the ecclesiastic; the third containing nine on the special duties of religieuse.

The whole book, though primarily designed for the members of the Society of Jesus, will be found of service to all who seek a thorough understanding of the great principles and methods of the spiritual life laid down by St. Ignatius. Both to those who give and to those who practice the Exercises, whether in daily meditation or in periodical retreats, the work will prove of decided use.

RELIGION ET CRITIQUE œuvre posthume de M. l'Abbé de Broglie recueillie par M. l'Abbé C. Piat. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris. 1 vol. in-12. 3 fr. 50.

We are mainly indebted to the Duke de Broglie for the publication of these essays, which form a sort of true counterpart to Mr. Balfour's *The Foundations of Belief*. The Abbé Piat, who acted as editor of the papers confided to him by the brother of the deceased priest, may not have given us all that was best among the literary remains of his gifted and loyal countryman, but what he has selected for us is of a very high order, and it forms a complete apology of the Christian faith in its superior relation to science and philosophy.

The author devotes much space to a definition of religion in its general acceptation. He tests the correctness of that definition, and proves its strength by examining the manifold influences of the religious idea upon art, speculative thought, and public as well as private morality. The symptoms of superstition, magic and spirit worship are traced in their relation to religious sentiment. From this general definition the Abbé de Broglie passes to that of the true

religion, the existence of which is supported by what he styles the "philosophical presumptions" of men of all times.

In the next place the author questions history in order to prove the superiority of Christianity in its practical bearing upon the advancement of human kind to a higher ideal. This includes a comparison of various religious systems which are all in a manner subordinate to Judaism and Christianity, of which the former is merely the vestibule. This chapter, which is an opening lecture of a course on the history of non-Christian religions, should be read as an introduction to the author's principal work, his *Histoire des Religions.*

The third step in the work leads to an exposition of the relations between religion and science. All the conflicts which are aroused between these two attributes of perfect humanity rests only on the seeming basis of assumption in place of facts; they are either metaphysical *opinions* opposed to faith or dogmatic *opinions* opposed to science.

The conclusion is an appeal to common sense as the point of departure and control of philosophical speculation, and a comparison between progress relatively on the lines of evolution and on those of Christian principle.

The Abbé Piat introduces the volume by an unusually able preface, in which he points out the achievements and the originality of methods in M. de Broglie's apologetic work.

BRIEFS FOR DEBATE. Edited by W. Du Bois Brookings, A. B., and Ralph Curtis Ringwalt, A. B. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1896. Pp. xlvii., 213. Pr. $1.25.

One of the chief difficulties experienced by those who have the management of young men's literary societies is that of getting the members to take sustained interest in such exercises as develop mental growth and vigor. The tendency to mere social amusement and pastime gives too little play for intellectual endeavor. Debating has long since been tried as a stimulus to higher things, but has generally been found wanting. Probably it may be that a lack of efficacy of the debating exercises in producing the looked-for result has been due to the improper methods adopted in carrying them out. Managers and participants have been obliged to draw

on a too-limited experience in the conducting of such exercises in a way to make them at once attractive and fruitful. A book like the one before us will go far to supplement such experience. The introduction, on the art of debate, offers valuable suggestions as to selection of questions, sources, and use of materials, practice, criticism, management, bibliography, etc. The body of the work is made up of Briefs for Debate. They number seventy-five in all, and are selected from a much larger collection prepared during the past ten years by Harvard students. The subjects cover the field of politics, economics and sociology, and have been chosen because of their timely, practical bearing. They are just those on which every intelligent reader of current periodical literature has some more or less confused notions and on which he feels he ought to have more precise and detailed information. Each brief gives the arguments for both sides of the respective question with reference to the pertinent bibliography from which the debater may gather fuller material. An appended list of two hundred additional topics points the way to other inexhaustible fields.

There is a freshness, a nerve about these briefs which contrast strikingly with the ancient is-the-pen-mightier-than-the sword method. With such a book in hand a live director ought to be able to sustain in healthy exercise almost any organization not wholly undeserving of the adjective literary.

TAQUISARA. By F. Marion Crawford. Two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan and Co.) 1896. Pr. $2.00.

Marion Crawford's Italian stories are, as a rule, interesting; they are written in an elevated style, and they show a fine perception of individual character. Yet the threads which hold his plots together are not only highly colored, but often tangled in so weird a fashion as to remind the reader involuntarily of the phantastic experiences related in the story of Mr. Isaacs, published years ago.

In "Taquisara" the author, instead of having recourse to preternatural agencies for the unraveling of the difficulties into which he gets his romantic actors, invents combinations which, though entirely unreal, will not appear so to the average reader who dwells outside of the mysterious circle into which Mr. Crawford affects to lead him. This might be well enough and to the credit of artistic

genius; but when invention plays foul with theology and with the facts that make religion reverenced, we have reason for criticism.

One of the chief *dramatis personae* in this novel is Don Teodoro Maresca, parish priest of Muro, in the Neapolitan district. Among his parishioners is the young Princess of Acireale, between whom and Gianluca, son of the Duchessa della Spina, there arises a love affair. Gianluca takes sick, and one day, while the princess, the priest and Taquisara, an intimate friend of the sick youth, are present in his room, he has a sudden spell which apparently indicates approaching death. The princess asks Don Teodoro to join them then and there in marriage. The priest complies, but ere he has completed the words of benediction, and whilst his eyes are raised to heaven, Gianluca falls back senseless, whilst Taquisara, dreading the idea of having the princess married to a corpse, snatches her hand out of that of his seemingly dead friend and holds it in his own. Whilst they are in this attitude the priest, not having noticed the change, pronounces the words "ego conjungo vos." Looking down he sees that Taquisara has taken the hand of the lady, who, being wholly unconscious of the act, believes herself married to Gianluca. The latter, after some time, revives, and appears happy in the thought of his marriage, which is to be ratified by the syndic as soon as Gianluca gets well.

The priest (sic) and Taquisara, a man of fine sense and education otherwise, are under the strange delusion that the real marriage took place between Taquisara and the princess, though both shrink from revealing the secret to Gianluca or the princess.

The strangest part, however, is that the priest, in order to obtain a dispensation which would annul the supposed marriage and leave Gianluca the right to claim his bride, goes to consult a great theologian, to whom he makes a confession. In his confession he reveals that he himself was never really ordained, but that through human respect he concealed the fact throughout a long missionary life. The theologian advises him (what any confessor should have done if the man had gone to confession at all during all these years) to be secretly ordained, and, to facilitate the matter, consults the Cardinal. The Cardinal is willing to ordain the penitent, but since Don Teodoro, in that case, would have to present himself in person and also indicate the persons involved in the marriage difficulty, the act would mean a breaking of the *sigillum*. This phase is so absurd that we do not see how any person at all familiar with the use of the Catholic sacraments could form such a view; for the Cardinal,

having Don Teodoro under his own jurisdiction, knowing the history of the priest's missionary career, and being, moreover, uncle of the princess who consulted him in her affairs, would have known the persons in question. Besides, the supposed priest (to say nothing of the combination of conscientious scrupulosity and sacrilegious deception in his character), is so utterly unreal a conception that there is no possible apology for the invention. Finally the Cardinal, who, like the learned theologian, seems to have forgotten both his theology and common sense, bids the latter to kneel down, asks him whether he is in the state of grace, says a prayer, throws his own chain and cross over the astonished priest, and tells him that he is now bishop. The new bishop hurries back, tells the sham pastor to kneel down, and makes him a priest. Then the priest hurries back to tell Taquisara that he is not married to the princess, a fact which the youngest seminarist might have told him without so much ado.

Any well-informed Catholic must recognize the absurd action of the plot, which could never possibly take place among Catholics of commonest sense, whether in Italy or in Africa, where the supposed priest had labored. Yet persons who are strangers to the uses of the Catholic Church, or converts who get the wrong end of the ceremonial despite their good will and grace of faith through baptism, might believe such things possible ; and the mere suggestion of a pretender acting the priest in the confessional and at the altar is enough with certain scrupulous souls to unsettle their minds. Of course, there may be impostors who assume the priestly character, but it is morally impossible, under the Catholic system of Church administration, that they can retain the mask for any length of time. Least of all such a one as Don Teodoro is described to be, who, whilst he never goes to confession—not even to make his Easter—(or if he does could certainly never get absolution, and therefore heaps sacrilege on sacrilege, defrauding, at the same time, thousands of Christians of their heavenly rights), is of so timorous a conscience that he hesitates in matters of plain duty, and runs to a theologian for advice when his studies—for he is a man of books and a lover of theological learning—if not common sense, must have taught him that the theologian would laugh at him (or ought to have done so) instead of consulting the Cardinal. We are at a loss to understand how Mr. Crawford could have invented and soberly written down such plot, for he, a professed Catholic, must know better, even if the readers for whom he plays do not.

THE AMERICAN ORDOS.

1.—*Ordo Divini Officii* recitandi Missaeque celebrandae juxta Rubricas, etc., cum Officiis Votivis ex Indulto pro Clero Saeculari Statuum Foed. Officiis generalibus hic concessis utente. Pro A. D. 1897. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

2.—*Ordo Divini Officii*, etc., a Clero Provinciarum S. Ludovici, Milwaukiensis, Chicagiensis, Sanctae Fidei, Dubuque.—St. Louis : B. Herder. 1897.

3.—*Ordo Divini Officii*, etc. Pro anno communi, 1897. Baltimorae : Typis Joannis Murphy et Sociorum.

4.—*Ordo Divini Officii*, etc. Pro Clero Universalis Ecclesiae. 1897.—Romae : Typis Guerra et Mirri. Cum Privilegio Summi Pontificis.

The above-mentioned Ordos include the daily Office of the Roman Church as recited by the secular clergy throughout the United States. They have, respectively, the *imprimatur* of the ecclesiastical superiors in whose territories they are used, whilst the Roman Office *Pro Urbe et extra Urbem* is printed *Cum Privilegio Summi Pontificis.*

The clergy of the Middle and Eastern States, where the privilege of the Roman Ordo (proper) is not granted, have reason to appreciate the general accuracy with which the Ordos of this year have been prepared, although there remain some minor errors, to which we shall call attention.

The fact that Easter occurs on the 18th of April brings the *Dominica in Albis* on the 25th, displacing St. Mark's feast. But although the feast itself yields to the Octave of Easter Sunday, the procession and Litany retain their place in the regular Office of that day, *i. e.*, the 25th April. In places where the Rogation Mass is chanted beside the Mass of the Sunday, it is to be sung in *tono feriali* and *without* "*Credo*," even though it be Sunday.[1]

In the *Monita* of the American Ordos the paragraphs treating of Requiem Masses must be corrected to bring them in harmony with two recent Decrees of the S. Cong. of Rites, quoted in the

1 Decr. S.C.R. Sept. 25, 1688.

REVIEW, Sept., 1896, and which we repeat in the present number (see Conferences). According to the latest *editio typica* of the Breviary, the third line of the hymn *Iste Confessor* is to be *meruit supremos* on the feast of St. Peter Dam., Febr. 23d. The reason for this is that the *dies obitus* of the Saint is Febr. 22d, and the feast, as a rule, has no first Vespers. The Pustet Ordo, according to its title page, is intended for the United States at large; it seems, however, more especially intended for the New England and Middle States; at least we find the anniversaries of the Election and Consecration of the Bishops of only this part of the country indicated. A slip containing corrections of the more important errors has been sent out by the publishers of this Ordo.

In the St. Louis Ordo, intended for the Western provinces, Febr. 20th, the Orat. pro Papa ob annivers. creationis is erroneously assigned to third place. It should be: 3 Or. *Ecclesiae*, 4 Or. pro Papa. Febr. 23d the *m. t. v.* for the *Iste Confessor* is not noted. Nothing is said about the Rogation Mass on April 25th. We could not find the festum *Puritatis B. M. V.* for St. Louis and Kansas City. As these two dioceses celebrate the Anniv. Ded. Eccl. on the third Sunday of October, we expected to find the festum Puritatis B. M. V. assigned to October 22d, as *dies fixa*. Finally, we may mention that there is a want of agreement in the various Ordos and Directories regarding the dates of the election and consecration of some of our Bishops. Thus, *e. g.*, in the St. Louis Ordo, May 21st is given as the Anniv. transl. of Archbishop Kain; whereas, according to Hoffmann's Directory, Bishop Kain was appointed Coadjutor cum jure successionis on July 6th. If this latter date is correct, it is the proper day on which to celebrate the anniv. transl., according to the decision of the S. Cong. of Rites, Jan. 30, 1878. Again, March 11th is assigned as the dies anniv. Elect. of the Bishop of Brooklyn by the Pustet Ordo, Nov. 11th by the Baltimore Ordo of 1896. The dates of the Election and Consecration, respectively, of the Bishop of Albany, according to the Pustet Ordo, are May 15th and July 4th; according to Hoffmann's Directory May 11th and July 1st.

The compiler of the Baltimore Ordo has taken particular trouble to have the correct dates of the anniversaries of Episcopal elections which (not the date of Consecration) require commemoration in the liturgy. These dates will be found in another part of the present issue (Conferences), as likely to be of service for reference when the Ordo is at fault.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM; or Protestantism Refuted and Catholicism Established by an Appeal to the H. Scriptures, etc. By the Rev. Stephan Keenan. With latest revisions by Rev. George Cormack, and Preface by the Rt. Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S B —London: Burns & Oates. (Benziger Bros.) 1896. Pp. 255. Pr. 50 cents.

NOTES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By the Rt. Rev. Edward Bagshawe, D.D., Bishop of Nottingham.—London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. (Benziger Bros.) 1896. 12mo. Pp. 287. Pr., bd., $2.00.

THE ABBÉ DE LAMENNAIS and the Liberal Catholic Movement in France. By the Hon. W. Gibson.—London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1896. 8vo. Pp. 346. Pr. $4.00.

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY of Philadelphia. Published quarterly. September, 1896. Pr. $2.00 per year.

LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES PERRAUD. By Augustin Largent, priest of the Oratory. Authorized Translation. Introduction by His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons.—New York: The Cathedral Library Association. 1896.

PRAELECTIONES DOGMATICAE quas in Collegio Ditton-Hall habeba Christianus Pesch. S.J.—Tomus IV: De Verbo incarnato—De B. V. Maria—De Cultu Sanctorum. Pr. $1.90. Tomus VI: De Sacramentis in genere—De Baptismo—De Confirmatione—De SS. Eucharistia. Friburgi Brisg. 1896. Sumpt. Herder (St. Louis, Mo.). Pr. $2.20.

THE SERMONS AND LECTURES OF THE REV. MICHAEL B. BUCKLEY, of Cork, Ireland. Edited by his sister, Kate Buckley. With a Memoir of his Life by the Rev. Charles Davis, Skibbereen, Dioc. of Ross.—Dublin: Sealy, Bryers & Walker. (Published for the editress.)

THE SECRET DIRECTORY. A Romance of Hidden History. By Madeleine Vinton Dahlgren.—Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co. 1896. 12mo. Pp. 330. Pr., bd., 75 cents.

THE QUEEN'S NEPHEW. An historical narration from the early Japanese Mission. By Rev. Joseph Spillman, S. J. Transl. from the German by Miss Helena Long.—St. Louis, Mo. B. Herder. 1896. 16mo. Pp. 149. Pr., bd., 50 cents.

MOSTLY BOYS. Short stories by Francis J. Finn, S.J. Enlarged edition. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1897. 12mo. Pp. 224. Pr., bd., 85 cents.